The
Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XIV. *June, 1908.* *No. 6*

THE APOSTOLIC SEE.[1]

I.

Our knowledge of the century that includes the death of St. John the Apostle and the first establishment of the Christian religion throughout the broad Empire of Rome is indeed imperfect, not to say obscure. But two lines of Christian thought and action stand out clearly and are admitted by all, however various and self-contradictory are the interpretations of the admitted facts and documents. The infant Church, apart from her memorable struggle with the civil power of Rome for the right to exist, was all along engaged in a no less momentous domestic conflict, first with the converts from Judaism and second with the converts from Greek and Roman paganism. Too many of the former looked on the new movement as no more than a fresh awakening of the Old Testament life and polity, the anxiously-awaited dawn of fulfillment of those promises that had so long fed the courage of Israel, a glorious proselytism for the Temple

[1] A discourse preached Sunday, May 3, 1908, in the Cathedral, Baltimore, on the occasion of the consecration of Rt. Rev. Denis J. O'Connell, D. D., as Bishop of Sebaste, from Matth. xvi, 18-19:

"And I say to thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."

and its institutions destined in this way to rise again from the material ruin and moral humiliation that had fallen on Jerusalem. Too many of the latter saw in the new Christian teaching and organization a kind of academic mixing-bowl into which might be cast the Gospel of Christ, the idealism of Plato, the erudition and logic of Aristotle, and the multitudinous vagaries of the Graeco-Roman Orient, in other words the system known as Gnosticism or the highest spiritual knowledge. The first post-apostolic century of the Church is very largely nothing more than a life and death conflict with these two movements, as deeply antagonistic to the nature and calling of the true Church as they were to one another. They were after all not new movements, but activities of a much earlier time, newly-quickened by the rapid advance of the religion of Jesus Christ, or rather sharply challenged by the latter, which daily swelled the ranks of its adherents at the expense of the old Israel, of Greek philosophy and of a hundred forms of Oriental worship and speculation from the Nile and the Orontes to the Indus and the Ganges. No doubt there was reasoning a-plenty against the narrowness and selfishness of the Judaizers and the misty hallucinations of the Gnostics, but the records of Christian antiquity are there to show that the victory was won for the Christian multitude by a vigorous appeal to the criterion of *Apostolicity,* i. e., to identity of Christian belief with that of the apostolic age. St. Justin, himself a native of Palestine, might dispute learnedly with the Rabbis of Ephesus, and even after him we hear echoes of second and third century disputes between the synagogues and the churches. But when it was all well over, by the middle of the second century, the figure and the teaching best remembered were those of Hegesippus, himself a Jew and the first historian of the Catholic Church. He had travelled widely through the Roman world in search of a working criterion of the religious truth taught by the Christian Society, and found it in the universal identity of doctrine with that of the apostles. Some precious fragments of his description of the sub-apostolic period have reached us, and from them we see that while on the one hand he enumerates all existing half-Jewish, half-Christian

sects and gives the names of their founders, on the other he praises the universal agreement of the Christian Churches throughout the Roman Empire based on the regular succession of their bishops from the apostles. Towards the end of his life he spent a long time at Rome, and drew up from the archives of the Roman Church the first known list of the successors of St. Peter, some of whose names have reached us (Anicetus, Soter, Eleutherus), though the rest of the document has long been lost, perhaps not hopelessly. Quite certainly he looked on the succession of Roman bishops as a guarantee that the apostolic doctrine had been preserved at Rome in its virginal purity, and that no concept of the Old Testament or of the rôle of Israel could pass for Christian which was there condemned. It is indeed unique and persuasive when we meet this conclusion in the extant fragments of the earliest history of the sub-apostolic period, in the mouth of a man who, St. Jerome tells us, followed closely on the Apostles' own time and whose life covers the period from about 120 (the death of St. John the Apostle) to about 180 when the Christian religion had fairly won its first hard battle for existence. His sole aim in life was to assure himself that he was believing in all that the Lord Jesus had taught. He travelled far and wide for that sole purpose, and believed firmly that the true criterion of Christian faith was in the unbroken succession of the properly appointed successors of the Apostles (i. e., the bishops). He had himself collected many principal facts and documents concerning the apostolic times, and dying left in his account of those times, and as a principal document, not the succession of bishops of Jerusalem or Antioch or Alexandria, but the full catalogue of the bishops of Rome, as though satisfied that he had reached the living centre of Christian truth where the new heresies, especially the Judaizing falsehoods, would certainly be cast out, as indeed they were. The mass of Israel, however, was yet no less carnal than in the time of its Redeemer and the millions of its children, both in and out of the empire, long continued to dream, and even to plan, a restoration of Sion to political greatness and even supremacy. Our good Hegesip-

pus, as simple in heart as he was in style, belonged to the race of Nicodemus, and they were ever few in Israel. Nevertheless, in the remote beginnings of the Christian religion he is an important witness to an early and general consensus of all Christians that in the succession of Peter and Paul was to be found always genuine Christian truth, and that all teaching which differed from theirs was the particularistic teaching of sects and heresies, and offered no guarantee of a living contact with the teaching and the will of the Divine Founder.

But while Israel long and fiercely opposed the divorce of Christianity from its own too secular concept of the Old Testament religious life and organization, the new religion was in even greater danger from the miscellaneous multitude that thronged to it from the temple-spaces and the lecture-halls of the philosophers. The rapid and compulsory unification of the mighty Mediterranean state known as the Roman Empire was not accompanied by any similarly thorough transformation of the minds and hearts of its hundred million subjects. The wide tossing sea itself was not more restless and changing than the multitude of any Greek or Roman city, especially in the refined and luxurious Orient, where freedom of thought was as untrammelled as political servility was abundant. The religions of conquered peoples, East and West, had long been affecting to its detriment the rude and rather austere pagan worship of Rome and the Latin peoples; with similar hopes they approached the new religion of Christ and sought alliance with it now in one shape and now in another, but chiefly through curious speculations about the origin of the world and man, the nature of evil, the relations of spirit and matter, the future resurrection, etc. This is what came to be known as Gnosticism or Scientific Religion. The countless advocates of this antique "Modernism" assured the Christian authorities of their orthodoxy, the compatibility of their teachings with the Gospel, even of special secret revelations of the Apostles and first Christian converts. Its propaganda was incredibly active, widespread and seductive. The yet extant relics of its religious literature are enough to astound us when we think how little has been saved, let us say concern-

ing the earliest popes or many of the Roman emperors. It was really responsible for the creation of what we call Christian theology, i. e., a rational and scholarly defence and illustration of the teaching of the Gospel and Holy Church. The most vigorous opponent of this pseudo-Christianity arose at Lyons in Gaul, a Christian bishop known as Irenaeus, born towards the year 150, probably in populous Asia Minor, itself a hotbed of Gnosticism. He had spent some years at Rome as a Christian teacher, and was therefore well equipped to produce his large Greek work "Against All Heresies," in which he explains and confutes all the false forms of Christianity that were current before the end of the second century. With extensive knowledge and much acumen he pursued the hydra-headed Gnosticism of his day, and his book remains forever a curious monument to the character of the Christian Church, its constitution and its teaching, its aim and even its history, also in some ways a valuable record of the age in which he wrote. But against the heresies of his day, in particular Gnosticism in all its shapes, the chief line of argument of this great scholarly bishop of the end of the second century, this cultured and travelled and practical administrator of the most important Western Church outside of Italy, this Asiatic Greek in the See of Lyons, is neither scriptural nor theological—it is the lack of genuine apostolic character. The true sense of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, he says, is easy to learn and to use his own words "it is within the power of all in every Church, who may wish to see the truth, to contemplate clearly the tradition of the apostles manifested throughout the whole world." It is visible in the unbroken succession of bishops instituted by the apostles in the Churches founded by them.[2] But he goes on to say that the apostolic succession is

[2] The following words of his contemporary Tertullian (*De Praescr.* ch. 39) exhibit with the legal precision peculiar to him the attitude of the African Christians towards the apostolic office of the Roman Church.

"Come now, thou that wilt exercise thy curiosity to better purpose in the business of thy salvation, run over the Apostolic Churches in which the very chairs of the Apostles, to this very day, preside over their own places, in which their own authentic writings are read, echoing the voice, and making the face of each present. Is Achaia near to thee? Thou hast

lodged principally in the succession of Roman bishops; he enumerates the twelve successors of St. Peter and St. Paul from Linus to the contemporary Eleutherus (and this is the oldest extant catalogue of the popes, also the oldest history of the popes, for he enumerates touching details of their lives); he insinuates clearly that they were especially honest, perfect and blameless men, in whose ears the preaching of the Apostles still echoed and before whose eyes their traditions were ever supreme. Above all, this particular succession of Christian bishops stands in a peculiar and pre-eminent way as a guarantee of apostolic truth, a touchstone of un-Christian or anti-Christian teaching, a shining light to both friend and foe. His golden words deserve to be quoted in full:

"Since, however, it would be very tedious in such a volume as this, to reckon up the successions of all the Churches, we do put to confusion all those who, in whatever manner, whether by an evil self-pleasing, by vainglory, or by blindness and perverse opinion, assemble in unauthorized meetings; (we do this, I say), by indicating that tradition derived from the apostles, of the very great, the very ancient, and universally known Church founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul; as also (by pointing out) the faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of the successions of the bishops. For it is a matter of necessity that every Church should agree with this Church, on account of its pre-eminent authority, that is, the faithful everywhere, inasmuch as the apostolical tradition has been preserved continuously by those (faithful men) who exist everywhere."

He then enumerates the list of Roman bishops, as one might enumerate the list of Presidents of the United States, and adds:

Corinth. If thou art not far from Macedonia, thou hast Philippi, thou hast the Thessalonians. If thou canst travel into Asia, thou hast Ephesus. But if thou art near to Italy, thou hast Rome, whence we also have an authority at hand. That Church how happy! on which the Apostles poured out all their doctrine with their blood; where Peter had a like passion with the Lord; where Paul is honoured with an end like the Baptist's; where the Apostle John was plunged into boiling oil, and suffered nothing, and was afterwards banished to an island; let us see what she hath learned, what taught, what fellowship she hath with the Church of Africa likewise."

"In this order and by this succession the ecclesiastical tradition from the Apostles and the preaching of the truth have come down to us. And this is most abundant proof that there is one and the same vivifying faith, which has been preserved in the Church from the apostles until now and handed down in truth (*Adv. Haeres,* III, 3, 3)."

It would be hard, says an illustrious modern Church historian, to find a more concise expression of the doctrinal unity then existing in the universal Church; of the sovereign and unique importance of the Roman Church as witness, guardian and organ of the apostolic tradition; and of its superior pre-eminence in the group of Christian communities.[3]

Through these three centuries the Roman Church had no rival for its perilous pre-eminency, which was so marked that the Emperor Decius, when about to undertake the extermination of the Christian religion, declared that he would rather behold the rise of an usurper than another bishop of Rome. The oldest Christian Churches, like Corinth and Antioch, recognized its supreme dignity. Before the end of the first century the former appealed to the Roman Church to heal a painful schism, and while the second century was yet young, Ignatius of Antioch addressed the Roman Church as the president of the Christian Society and acknowledged with gratitude the reception of its instructions and commands. During this period the bulk of the Christian body was in the Roman Orient, yet its supreme government, as far as we can now grasp it, was certainly in the See of Peter. Thither came the heads of the great heresies of Gnosticism, Marcionism, Montanism, Sabellianism, asking for recognition, and rebellious only when they fail to secure the authority and prestige of that ancient Church. In all the domestic controversies of those centuries that Church ever dominates the scene. It is not Rome that weakens during the earlier controversies, but Asia Minor; not Anicetus who visits Smyrna to confer with Polycarp, but that aged man of

[3] Mgr. Duchesne, in BULLETIN, X, 430. For a good commentary on this famous passage of St. Irenaeus, and a refutation of various efforts made to blunt its point, see L. Rivington, *The Primitive Church and the See of Peter* (London, 1894), 31-38.

80 years who comes to Rome to deal with the pope. And later no bishop of the Orient, nor all of them, dared to order all their episcopal brethren to meet in councils and report to him as Pope Victor did; much less did they dare to excommunicate, or threaten to excommunicate, entire provinces, if they did not obey, i. e., to cut them off from the common unity in Christ, as the same pope did, and as Pope Stephen did a little later when the African churches clung stubbornly to their narrow views on the re-baptism of heretics. In matters of Christian faith it brought before its tribunal the highest Christian scholarship in the person of Origen, and it called for explanation and submission from high-placed and saintly bishops like Dionysius of Alexandria, while the supreme tribunal of the empire recognized at the same time that in practice the bishop of Rome was the judge of Christian life and discipline. It is to the Roman Church that critical scholars, some of them neither Catholics nor genuine Christians, trace back the most solemn and far-reaching measures and institutions that consolidated the fluent elements of the earliest Christian life,—the closing of the canon of the New Testament and the diffusion of its books; the formulation of the Apostles' Creed or that simple and ancient rule of faith that each convert, Jew or heathen, had to learn and accept as a sufficient catechism of the new belief; the creation of a special religious code for Christians, i. e., the beginnings of the canon law, which the oldest Greek Christian texts with curious unanimity refer to a Roman origin. I might add other grave considerations that place beyond a doubt the unique magisterial office of the Roman Church in the earliest and darkest days of the Christian religion, when its bishops everywhere were in daily peril of their lives as confessedly the sources and guarantors of the peculiar religious obstinacy that maddened at once and appalled the governors of the Roman world. I will mention but one more such illustration. Out of the remotest Christian antiquity come reliable statements that the Roman Church during these three centuries was wont to exercise a truly imperial charity towards multitudes of Christians in all parts of the Roman Empire. From Greece, Syria, Asia Minor, Arabia came pitiful cries

for help amid the ceaseless local persecutions of the brethren, and it is no Latin writer, but a Greek, the great Church historian Eusebius of Caesarea, who tells us that even to his day, i. e., the first quarter of the fourth century, the Roman Church still dispensed to the ends of the empire her rich and immemorial bounties.

If I have dwelt at some length on these features of the primitive Roman supremacy among the earliest Christian Churches, it is because, considered in their entirety, they reproduce for us at that early date not only the continuous fact of the apostolic authority in its fulness, but also its original aim and its genuine spirit, i. e., the practical effective unity of the Christian ideals in belief and in life, and a permanent, deep, transforming affection for the common welfare that was like a tide of new blood in the veins of a decadent age and a corrupt society. The history of the Roman Church in these three centuries is in reality an enlarged Acts of the Apostles.

Feature for feature all the traits of the primitive Church found in the inspired record are met with in the Roman Church of this period—the conviction of responsible authority visibly lodged in an organized body; a full and sure and ready sense of all the Christian faith and an equally reliable sense of religious falsehood; an adequate appreciation of the universal interests and the common welfare; a large and moderate view of the exercise of authority; an habitual confession of a higher will, that of Jesus Christ, as the true source of the new power over men's minds and hearts. In faith, in discipline, in government, in its public services, in its continuous charitable solicitude for all the scattered brethren in Christ the Roman Church was in those centuries truly an "imago primaevi saeculi," a mirror of the apostolic age.

"Thus," says an illustrious historian, "the churches of the entire world, from Arabia, Osrhoene, Cappadocia, to the extremities of the West, experienced in everything, in faith, in discipline, in government, in ritual, in works of charity, the incessant activity of the Roman Church. It was everywhere known, as St. Irenaeus says, everywhere present, everywhere respected, everywhere followed in its advice. Against it there rises no opposition, no rivalry. No com-

munity entertains the notion of putting itself on the same footing as Rome. Later, patriarchates and other local primacies will come into being. In the course of the third century, one barely sees their first outlines, more or less vague, in process of formation. Above these organisms just forming, as well as above the collection of the isolated churches, there looms up the Roman Church in its sovereign majesty, the Roman Church represented by its bishops, the long series of whom is connected with the two coryphaei of the apostolic chorus; the Church which knows itself and declares itself and is considered by the whole world to be the organ and center of unity." [4]

During all this time, moreover, its bishops were held in peculiar veneration by all Christians. Many of them shed their blood for Christ, and each of them was looked on in his own time as St. Peter himself in all the fulness of his public character. The individual pope might come from any part of the vast Empire of Rome, but his family and personality were ever of little account. Each one stood for the highest and most attractive religious idea and the most efficient religious organization that the world had yet beheld. And though he usually perished violently (for Cæsar was yet unwilling to sacrifice his own religious authority), it was not felt that his disappearance imperilled the precious interests committed to him as to a spiritual dictator in face of the ignorance, apathy, stupidity, malice, selfishness, and habitual vacillation of too many minds and hearts in all that pertained to the life of the spirit. Men spoke of them interchangeably as the *See* of Peter, the *Chair* of Peter, the *Place* of Peter. The authority of the great apostle, granted him as a reward of his faith, and for the preservation of the unity and efficiency of the Christian organization both in its primitive growth and amid the dramatic vicissitudes of later persecution and conflict, seemed even then solidly anchored, as it were, to a mighty rock, was identical and equal in each successor, identical and equal being the divine gift itself and the necessity for it, the good accomplished, the evils averted. What wonder, then that long before the Roman Church emerged

[4] L. Duchesne, BULLETIN (1904), x, 448.

from the catacombs, its bishops were wont to claim, and at Rome itself, an hereditary fulness of apostolic authority, and to quote for their flock as early as the time of St. Cyprian's death that divine charter of the papacy, the memorable words of St. Matthew (XVI, 118-19):

"And I say to thee: That thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth it shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth it shall be loosed also in heaven."

O fateful words! The pilgrim to the Fisherman's Tomb at Rome and the idle visitor lift up their eyes to-day and behold them written in gigantic letters about the base of the dome of St. Peter's, heralding forever and consecrating, as it were with befitting majesty, the incomparable genius that built for them this pedestal thrice glorious among the works of human imagination and skill. But far more glorious is the historical career of these words of power from the day when they were first uttered in remote Palestine to our own time. Nothing but their sacramental efficiency can explain the influence they have exercised in every century, in every form of civilization, amid all kinds and manners of men. They have sundered the spiritual from the temporal order, at an awful price, it is true, nevertheless by no means excessive; they have shaped the exercise of this dearly bought spiritual independence and conditioned the framework of ecclesiastical authority, whose dignity and serviceableness they have saved, while they prevented it from degenerating into anarchy or becoming hopelessly the tool of secular passion or purpose; they were ever and are yet the sufficient instruction of the successors of St. Peter, replete with freedom of action, but also replete with terrible admonition for men who believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ, His tender affection for Holy Church, and His inevitable just judgment of those who sit in the place of Peter, but do not the works of Peter; they have affected the growth of great sciences, doctrinal theology, canon law, moral theology,

Church history, even of philosophy; they have fashioned effectively the civil and social order, for there was a long and troubled period when the average Christian mankind of Europe looked to the papacy as a paternal power, and saw in each succeeding pope a moral patriarchal authority, the only one capable of dominating an arbitrary feudalism, of compelling for the poor, weak, and helpless, some measure of justice, of enforcing basic principles of the law of nations, and of planting deeply in the heart of Europe those principles and ideals through which the Western world put off its ancient paganism and even yet stands out as fundamentally different from and superior to the non-Christian Orient; they were and are the divine source of the combined insight and courage which have regularly distinguished the successors of St. Peter, even when European society had reached the lowest ebb of its fortunes, and was everywhere dominated by a narrow and selfish secularism that abused holy institutions for vile ends. Through these divine and imperishable words the successor of St. Peter is forever lifted above the ordinary course of human passions and purposes, forever exhibited to mankind as the symbol of Christian unity, the criterion of Gospel truth and life, the witness and custodian of Christ's teachings, the judge of the brethren in all charity and equity, and therefore the natural guide and adviser of Christian society in all that pertains to religious faith and morality, and even in those large spheres and phases of human life that are affected for good or evil by our moral principles or rather by the lack or weakness of them.

II.

An essential feature of the original apostolic office was its witness unto Christ, not unto a portion of his life, but unto all His public career. On the morrow of the Ascension, when yet the Christian Church numbered about a hundred souls, the Apostles met under the presidency of Peter (Acts, I, 14-26) to select a successor to the traitor Apostle Judas. It may be truly called the first General Council, presided over by the first pope. "Wherefore," said the Prince of the Apostles,

"of these men who have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus came in and went out among us . . . . one of these must be made witness with us of His resurrection . . . to take the place of this ministry and apostleship from which Judas hath by his transgression fallen." It is precisely this feature of the apostolic office that stands out most strikingly in the Roman Church during the thousand years of medieval life. The other apostolic churches, like Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, gradually decayed, or were involved in wretched heresies, or became the prey of Islam. The brilliant civilization of the apostolic age was soon obscured in the Mediterranean world. The original monuments and documents, both of Church and State, disappeared or became unintelligible. Passionate new controversies killed off the interest in primitive Christianity, and a new order supervened everywhere, rather a total lack of order in those rude ages when the political, social, and economic life of the Greco-Roman world was everywhere overlaid with crude barbarism freshly renewed in every century by the eager sensual hordes that poured without ceasing from the mighty womb of the North and the East. At Rome itself a consul, that immemorial symbol of the Roman State, was no longer named; the majestic Senate-house on whose floor were debated the fates of kingdoms and provinces was closed and dumb; the vast population shrank to a handful; the prestige and power of the City men proudly called Eternal had passed away, or rather were disputed by jealous Greeks, fanatic Arabs, and proud and turbulent Germans. A little more and the prophetic fear of Scipio Africanus had become a reality; Rome, like Troy and Carthage would have passed into the realm of shadows. It was a crucial time, whose true significance can be read in Cardinal Newman's *Historical Sketches* and in the noble volumes of Mr. Allies. But graver than the decay of the glorious city itself was the peril that threatened Christian unity when for a while it seemed that for the future not the Roman by the Tiber but the Byzantine Greek by the Golden Horn would henceforth represent or dominate the apostolic witness to Jesus Christ, that the ever-latent secularism of the imperial office would strangle the hardbought spiritual indepen-

dence, and soon Rome would be as Constantinople, and later as Moscow, the seat of more or less venerable arch-chaplains of an Oriental ruler, local custodians of dead magnificence, Grand Lamas for the West.

But for the welfare of Holy Church and of humanity this early crystallization of the spiritual forces of the Gospel was not to happen in the West on the border line of the ancient world and the new states of Europe whose last most hopeful progeny even we of the New World now are. In the names and the memory of the glorious Apostles Peter and Paul the popes found always something sacramentally vigorous and restorative, a lasting echo as it were, an undying image of the "praedicatio veritatis," the fulness of Christian truth as it had been made known by the great Apostles and ever preserved in the Church founded by them and consecrated by their labours and their blood. The apostolic office and apostolic faith soon created their own monuments unique and wonderful, eternally voiceful of the purpose that underlay them. There stood, visible to all, the glorious sepulchres of Peter and of Paul. There rose the old basilica of St. Peter, for a thousand years the most venerable monument of the world, hallowed by a thousand great events, itself the silent witness of the permanency of the apostolic office, crowded with memories and proofs of the tender gratitude to Christian Rome both of the ancient world that lay dying and of the new peoples rudely surging in to take its place, one day to bear its complex burden. In the old St. Paul's stood during all this period the evergrowing series of medallions that exhibited in imperial mosaic the list of the successors of the Fisherman, while throughout and around the City were scattered venerable relics and evidences of their sojourn, their apostolic activity, and the deep respect that the Roman Christians showed their fathers in the faith while yet a Hadrian pondered over the Gospel or in his immortal memoirs a Marcus Aurelius with imperial melancholy fixed its essence as an incorrigible resistance to the omnipotence of the Roman State. To-day the genius of Catholic investigators and the pick of the new fossors reveal not a few incredibly convincing proofs of this, as both scholar and excavator work

their way through such early Christian cemeteries as that of Domitilla and that of Priscilla, where once were buried members of Cæsar's household and foremost consular nobles, whose names yet grace the pages of Tacitus and Suetonius, but who had then caught the Gospel from the lips of Peter and Paul. From all parts of the world, despite the wretched anarchy of the times, long armies of pilgrims never ceased to visit the sepulchres of Peter and Paul and to acquire within their shadow both the letter and the spirit of the Gospel. This pilgrimage to Rome was the most unifying institution of a period when the entire West had scarcely a city worthy of the name and function. It is to-day as important as ever in the regular visit of every Catholic bishop to the source of apostolic authority, but its origin is lost in the dim beginnings of the papal succession, while at the same time it is one of the most irrefragable evidences that Christian Europe at least always saw in the succession of Peter the only divine guarantee that it was receiving an uncontaminated gospel, and not the conclusions of Arius and Nestorius, or the secular makeshifts of court-bishops and ignorant soldiers.

And in as far as the successor of Peter could not behold the entire Christian world, his letters, issued always by the authority of Peter and Paul, went far and wide every day of this thousand years, and brought home, for example to the most lonely priest of the Orkneys or the Faroes, a sense of union and communion with the entire Christian world and a conviction that the Christian religion held its way continuously, that Christ was not preached in vain nor was faith in Him a vain thing both for priest and people. The countless missionaries who in those ages went forth to conquer for Christ the surrounding moral darkness held their work but weakly done, if it was not begun with the approval of the Apostolic See, like that of Saint Patrick, or if it was not soon placed under the saving direction of the same like that of Saint Boniface. Well indeed for all those strong but uncultivated races that they were so soon in touch with the Eternal City, for thereby they not only secured easily and permanently religious unity with the rest of Europe, but they also obtained the first elements of civilization. May they

always be thus divided for the benefit of Rome, says the pagan Tacitus, describing the internecine quarrels of the Britons under the stern generalship of Agricola, that perfect apostle of the old order. Nay, rather lay aside your wasteful warfare and be united in Christ Jesus, and learn the arts of a higher and a better life, said the missionary to the Angles and Saxons, those rude men of Schleswig-Holstein and Jutland who soon drove out the Britons from their pleasant home. And they were united, and with the Christian faith that they received from Pope Gregory, whom they ever revered as their special apostle in Christ Jesus, they soon also entered on a higher culture, learned of an alphabet and of the preservation of the most useful thought, of written law and fixed judicial procedure, of a better warfare by rational argument, of the refinement of the spirit as more desirable than the gross pleasures of violent passions. And as the missionary worked in union with the See of Peter his efforts were never in vain, for he was only the far-flung pioneer in the great system of Christianity that centered at Rome, and knew that when he fell another would come to take his place. The obligation of the metropolitans to obtain the pallium from Rome came soon to remind the new churches that they were offshoots of a great trunk, and that only by close contact with the parent stem could they be protected at once against themselves and against the forces of secularism that too often they did not recognize, and when they did were too weak to resist it or cast off its yoke. They owed it to the Apostolic See that they kept for a thousand years that beneficent unity of faith which was the basis of all their spiritual advancement and of their growth in all the arts of civilization. Indeed, whatever monuments they have left, like their beautiful old cathedrals, are the products of Catholic faith and still cry out for its once majestic exercise.

We need not wonder therefore that in the thousand years which elapsed from the Fall of Rome to the invention of printing, the successor of Peter was universally known as the apostolic man par excellence, the "Apostolicus," the "Domnus Apostolicus," the Apostolic Chief, or that men spoke less frequently of Rome and more often of the "Sedes Apostolica,"

the apostolic seat or centre of Christian religious authority visibly identical with its divine origin amid the vicissitudes of the ages as they came and went. Nor ought we forget that if in the more refined East a subservient episcopate had not soon sacrificed the Catholic doctrine concerning the divinity, person, and natures of Our Lord Jesus Christ, it was chiefly owing to the courage with which at all times the Roman church set forth its testimony to the truths handed down by its apostolic founders. From the fourth to the seventh century, in popes like Julius and Damasus, in Celestine and Leo, in Martin and Agatho, the Eastern bishops and the great Eastern Councils of Ephesus, Chalcedon and Constantinople are dominated by the traditional authority of the Apostolic See, which in all this dogmatic strife ever appears not as an equal, but as head and judge, as a sure and only witness to the original Christian truth.

III.

But if the Apostolic See has been at all times and among all other peoples the indispensable and indestructible centre of religious unity and the root of spiritual progress, it has been all that in our own beloved land, and in a very eminent degree. Without question the Catholic Church in this United States owes to the successors of Peter its existence, preservation and progress, to such an extent that without their power and influence steadily exerted in every year of this "saeculum mirabile" the majestic unity of religious sense and forces and institutions that we call American Catholicism would now be a series of weak and divided factions and parties, or submerged in an undistinguishable mass of rationalism and naturalism. We have only to recall hurriedly the conditions in the Old World and the New out of which our Church arose.

One hundred years ago this world of ours went through a chain of crises such as it had never experienced since the dissolution of the civil power of Rome. Men have agreed to call these crises by the name of the French Revolution, because France was the principal scene of these mighty overturnings,

and because she has never ceased to maintain the results and to propagate the spirit and the aims of these marvelous decades. Her children were the philosophers, prophets, poets and generals of the Revolution, as well as its law-makers and executors. From Syria to Drontheim, from Paris to San Domingo, wherever the tricolor waved and the drum beat out the Marseillaise, there rose from the throats of countless men of France such a protest against the existing condition of things in this world as had never yet been heard by any ill-fated shepherds of men. The oppressed everywhere sympathized with this wild outburst of a whole people. Their rulers in vain tried to curb the new power that had broken its bonds like a volcano and was vomiting on all sides death and destruction. All know the story—that awful "Night of the Gods"—the unparalleled decade from 1790 to 1800, the glorious shame and the shameful glory, the injustice of men and the long-delayed justice of God, the tottering and engulfing of thrones and altars and the upbuilding of new social foundments, the final passing of old and decayed social strata and the consolidation anew of rank and class, the golden roll of the world's greatest victories and the unspeakable groanings and agonies of a whole society, slaughtered apparently for ambition's sake,—more truly as an enormous providential blood-letting for a fever that was running in irresistible paroxysms. Behold now the deepest mystery of it all! These millions, drunk with license and triumph, free from all restraint, clamor once more for a master. On the blood-soaked soil of France, under the shadow of a thousand guillotines, in an atmosphere of savagery and blasphemy, they are building anew the throne of a king,—nay, of a king of kings, an emperor, and will lift upon it the figure of the Little Corsican! Marengo, Austerlitz, Jena hallow it with more blood than was poured out about the throne of Alexander or Cæsar. In the wake of this great consecration, law and order, peace and humanity come timidly back to their places. Time mends again her shattered loom and spins anew the usual web of life. Man had wanted to see by what original processes and vicissitudes society was formed; he had wished to penetrate those ancient and awe-

some secrets of God and history that were well forgotten. One brief hour of Marat, Danton, Robespierre, and the thousand human monsters that he had loosed from their cages, was enough. Let there be one chief henceforth, and let men shudder no more before these fatal

> "Dragons of the prime
> That tear each other in their slime."

But it was on the head of the Church of Rome that this storm broke with the utmost violence. In all those wonderful years two popes, Pius VI and Pius VII, walked a dolorous way and were the broken-hearted witnesses of the deepest humiliation that had yet befallen the See of Peter. Out of the revolt of Martin Luther, but after incredible exertions, the popes had saved the Mediterranean world. Now the Latin genius itself seemed to apostatize and was calling loudly for the crucifixion of the mother which bore it, nursed it, raised it to manifold greatness, and when its original empire was lost gave it a new world for the exercise of its gifts. The so-called Catholic States of Europe vied with one another in attaining over religion within their domains the same free hand that the non-Catholic States had acquired, and as we near the end of the eighteenth century, and the first wild mutterings of the Revolution are heard, Gallican and Jansenist, Febronian and Josephist agree with the apostles of Deism and Rationalism that the See of Peter must cease to exist, must perish amid every evidence of contempt and injustice. And as for more than a thousand years the Western Churches were most intimately dependent on the See of Peter, it followed logically that the fall of the queenly mother would entail the overthrow of the daughters; nor was it otherwise, as is known to all.

Amid these circumstances were formed the first Catholic Churches in the United States, timid and insignificant, almost purely spiritual entities, with nothing but a doctrine and some memories, disheartened beyond measure by the contemporary wreckage of the stately churches of their European brethren. All other Christian bodies were historically antagonistic to

them, and tolerated them often only for their pitiful helplessness. They were without traditions or customs, without literature or art or schools, without monuments or institutions, for the most part scattered groups of exiles driven hither by poverty or civil oppression or religious persecution. If the great Catholic Churches of the Old World lay then in the dust, those of the New World were in the beginning all but invisible. Happily for them a series of providential circumstances had made the new state a land of religious freedom and in this new State the Catholics had been generally foremost in patriotic conviction, toil, and sacrifice, for the establishment of the new republic. They could say, as Melito of Sardes once said to Marcus Aurelius, that their religion and the new republic had arisen at the same time and that an equal prosperity of growth had been vouchsafed both, as though an index of their mutual sympathy and service. With blood and counsel and treasure they had bought the right to worship God freely according to the dictates of their conscience, had anchored deeply in every Catholic heart the holy passion of patriotism, and had secured it forever by an inextinguishably grateful memory of religious equity and peace, written into the fundamental law of the people, and destined one day to repay a thousandfold the noble confidence which prompted a law surely indispensable at that time for the development of the Catholic religion.

The perils of American Catholicism were not therefore from without, but rather from within. How should the new Church be governed? Who should appoint its bishops, its ministering clergy? Where should their support come from? Who should own and administer the ecclesiastical property? What should be the limits of authority and obedience between the laity and the clergy? How should ecclesiastical justice be administered? In a word how should the constitution of the Catholic Church, partly divine and partly an ancient historical growth, be made to work in circumstances that on the one hand were truly favorable, on the other extremely difficult? It must be remembered that out of the eighteenth century anti-ecclesiastical and anti-papal conflicts and discussions some Catholics, both ecclesiastics and laymen, had brought with them to the New World a

certain menacing Liberalism, principles and views concerning ecclesiastical government not easily compatible with an immemorially hierarchical church. Then, too, the Catholic population was almost at once fed by an ever-expanding volume of immigration, men of various nations and tongues, likewise of divergent civil and religious training, of unequal social advantages, as different in mentality as they were in racial traits and temper. Nor could they be kept within easy reach and control of such toil-worn clergy as existed. Tempted by the vastness and freedom of their new lives the immigrants roamed far and wide over the boundless extent of the new state, wherever opportunity tempted or fate bore them, so that even the most elementary influence of religion was often foreign or rather unattainable to these children of untold generations of Catholics. The Catholic Church in the United States was confronted, at once and over half a world, with the most delicate internal problems and the commonest calls of justice and charity. And as though to render more difficult the adaptation of an old historical religion to such new and extraordinary circumstances human nature itself, the average social capacity, seemed suddenly to experience an incredible uplift. The native genius of the new republic attacked with vigor its chief obstacle, distance, and in a brief time had endowed humankind with the beneficent inventions that render forever famous the name of the United States. Space seemed at once to roll up and disappear, while time was so multiplied in value that the individual man seemed now to dispose of a quasi-eternity. In this new state the plain common man rose rapidly in dignity and self-respect. No law of caste, no tradition of hereditary government, no ancient privilege barred the way of the most lowly. Equality of citizenship, vastness of opportunity, and abundance of all natural resources so conditioned and developed human personality that often there was almost the force of an antique state in each superior man who arose to grapple with resisting nature or to forge into a working organism the raw political material that lay about him. The poor immigrant, usually from the humblest strata of European life, ignorant of the uses of political freedom and the solemn responsibilities of self-govern-

ment, was suddenly clothed with the dignity of a ruler in a very complex governmental system. Moreover, his fathers before him had been modest tillers of a few worn acres, and now he was given an abundance of virgin soil, with every advantage of climate, cultivation, demand and transportation! He had lived as a rule close to nature in a simple, frugal and obscure way, and now he was thrown by thousands into the most active, ambitious, and productive urban centres that the world had yet seen! His pleasures had hitherto been few and innocent, and the means of satisfying the higher and more violent passions had been to him, happily enough, unattainable. But now he was mightily solicited on all sides by a superb and manifold joy of life and action that knew no bounds, and was the exact opposite of the patient and gentle humility of sentiment, timidity of thought, and habitual self-repression that for long ages had been natural to him! Finally, he had lived under a paternal absolutism that looked with immemorial jealousy on all political freedom of thought and speech, especially in the plain multitude, holding it by nature and history incapable of political sense or wisdom. And now he was daily witness to an incredible universal frankness of criticism, a freedom and fulness of individual judgment on all subjects, an untrammeling of the mind scarcely imaginable to one brought up to respect the existing order and institutions of life as a little less than divinely ordained, certainly in practice unimpeachable or unimproveable by the majority of mankind!

IV.

Therefore whether we consider the vast scandal of the apparent failure and undoing of Catholicism in Europe, one hundred years ago, or whether we reflect on the dubious conditions and circumstances amid which the Catholic life began to organize itself in the United States, or whether we recall the contemporary universal discredit of all institutions that bore the stamp of antiquity and the huge pride of a new and free life that was everywhere in evidence, or whether we remember

that Catholicism, which from time immemorial counted the State itself and civil institutions as friendly and protective, was now as poor and insignificant as the lowliest of its members, the outlook for a rapid and orderly growth of its churches was not then encouraging to prudent men who properly appreciated at once the true nature of the Catholic Church and the character of the new times and new surroundings. Could she seek once more her origin in the womb of time and be truly born again? Could she renounce all but the essentials of her being, and recommence the toilsome and perilous and uncertain conquest of her own children, forget the glory of the past, the reverence and fear of kings, the admiration of entire peoples, the habit of motherly domination without close regard to the exact limits of the temporal and the spiritual? In other words, was a genuine Catholicism possible in the United States?

The answer lies in a century of unequalled growth, during which all the internal forces of Catholicism have had free play and after which it stands demonstrated to the world that in the United States the deepest religious sentiment and the most ardent civic loyalty find an equal shelter in every Catholic heart. We have all rejoiced these days with the populous and progressive dioceses of New York and Philadelphia at the rounding out of a century of vigorous religious life, nor is it necessary to point to the material evidences of the vigor and solidity of the faith and generosity of the three generations which have made possible the wonderful Catholic monuments of worship, education, and charity that grace these noble cities and exhibit publicly the true spirit and the real uses of the Catholic faith. In such matters these two dioceses are only foremost among a hundred others equally zealous according to their population and their means. But infinitely greater for our nation's welfare than all the external works of this century of Catholicism is the undeniable evidence of the fundamental sympathy and harmony that have always existed between the genius of the American Commonwealth and the Catholic Church. By their fruits ye shall know them. As a rule great working ideals that are widely shared by an epoch or a people create for themselves strong and bold personalities

in whom these ideals are forever embodied and consecrated. And it has been even so with us in the short span of one hundred years. As long as our Catholic people can remember the names of such prelates as Archbishops John Carroll and John Hughes, and such citizens as Charles Carroll and Roger Taney, so long will they remember that the most glorious conquest of Catholicism in the New World is its unbroken moral coöperation with the Constitution and the institutions of this United States, and that if in the future men's souls should again be tried in some consuming furnace of public peril, the response from the children of the Catholic Church will never be unworthy of their famous ancestry.

And where could this assurance be more strongly felt or more justly proclaimed than in this mother church of our religion in the United States? Its prelates from the first to the latest have ever been men of strong and pure Catholic faith, but likewise men of equally ardent and enlightened patriotism. Its clergy and its laity, inheritors of a sturdy Catholicism that began nobly in the Ark and the Dove, have ever been conspicuous for their religious zeal, their generosity, and their civic devotion. From this pulpit, as from its native place, has ever issued a high and solemn appeal for the love of this glorious fatherland, for a perfect service of it, above all for lives that shall perpetuate it to the end of time in keeping with the ideals that were shared and proclaimed with equal earnestness by our First President and the first archbishop of this See. The world to-day looks on with astonishment at our rich development in fullest freedom of all the forces of Catholic life. But it ought never to be forgotten that to the prelates of this primatial See, and by reason of its very antiquity, its prominence, and its proximity to our seat of government, is largely owing the ample and well-justified confidence of the public authority in the devotion and fidelity of the entire Catholic body to the welfare of the nation. The fair daughters whose joy this venerable See shares these days went forth from her, but they went forth well equipped for their splendid career, indoctrinated with admirable principles of true religion and true patriotism, each in turn provided with a sum of experience

and insight that in those early days were invaluable, and each confident that here were wisdom and courage, affection and charity, tact and sympathy.

On the other hand, dearly beloved brethren, any outline of our Catholic life and progress would be at once unreal and unjust that did not take into consideration and acknowledge with gratitude the share of the Apostolic See, its constant solicitude, its wise direction, the benefit of its secular experience, and the guidance of the Holy Spirit that in the administration of the Church is ordinarily vouchsafed most abundantly through its head, the Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth. Since the division of the first diocese, the venerable See of Baltimore, one hundred years ago, some ninety dioceses have been created, about one-tenth of the actual Latin episcopate, so that a new diocese has arisen in our Church for nearly every year of the last century. When we reflect, on the one hand, that the diocese with its bishop is the original living cell of the Catholic organism, and on the other hand that the formation of each diocese means long and careful study, the exercise of prudence and equity, tact and conciliation, it must be at once evident that we are deeply indebted to the Apostolic See for what is on the whole an admirable repartition of our religious capacities, duties and resources. To this we must add the constant and immediate control of religious and ecclesiastical observance, the execution of the public laws of the Church, by frequent reports to the Apostolic See and by frequent visits of the bishops to the same immemorial source of Catholic wisdom. Within the same period three national councils and many provincial synods have been held, in all of which the Apostolic See has been immediately helpful and has brought the organization of the Catholic Church in the United States into full harmony with the intention and the general principles of universal canonical legislation. The same venerable See has never failed to insist on the education of a native clergy, and it is very largely to this that we owe to-day the system of provincial and diocesan seminaries and the novitiates of the religious orders out of which in no small measure have come the 16,000 priests who now minister to the needs of the American Catholic people.

It has been ever intent on diminishing and removing all causes or occasions of friction within the ranks of this clergy. We owe to it the harmony of action that exists to-day between the secular clergy and the religious orders working in the same territory and subject to the same wise general laws. To it also we owe the high degree of reverence and obedience that to-day everywhere marks the practical relations of the bishop and his clergy. In the Apostolic See the Catholic people of the United States have always found a final court of appeal, at once accessible, equitable, independent and powerful, which no unrighteous influence could easily deceive, or deceiving hope to maintain what it had gained. In a very particular manner we owe to the Apostolic See the practical and considerate legislation that in the course of a hundred years has enabled the Catholic Church in the United States to assimilate gradually and affectionately many millions of immigrants speaking many languages, formed differently by immemorial institutions and history, broken off with violence and often with hard injustice from their parent stem, cast across wide seas into a new and strange land.

Nor ought we forget that in all this legislation the Apostolic See has always been thoughtful for the public welfare of the Republic, the closer harmony of all its citizens for the common good and growth, an increase of respect for the public authority, and a larger and more intelligent coöperation for the knowledge and practice of those political virtues without which no State has hitherto managed to exist with peace and progress. In all these and other forms of beneficent direction the habitual instrument of the Apostolic See has been for us the Congregation of Propaganda. Amid these centenary feasts of rejoicing it seems certainly proper to pay just tribute to the wisdom and equity of its prefects, the learning of its canonists, the administrative skill and vigor of its secretaries, and the habitual devotion of its officials. Through this body the ancient legislation of the Church has been constantly revised for us and adapted to our needs, or new provision has been made for our new circum-

stances and conditions. It has borne the brunt of responsibility in all the larger activities necessary to safeguard the unity of Catholicism in the United States, to protect its dignity, to maintain its intrinsic strength and health, and to keep it in harmonious contact with the civil order.

If now I add that by sending an immediate representative to the Catholic Church in the United States the Apostolic See has recognized the full dignity of the latter and has provided for a more expeditious and satisfactory administration of its general interests, I shall have omitted no important step of the central authority in favor of the welfare of Catholicism in our beloved fatherland.

Dearly beloved brethren! It seems to me that in the sacred ceremony of this morning, the most solemn in all the rich ritual of the Church, we have a remarkable illustration of what I have been trying briefly to set before you, namely, the union of civic spirit and religious zeal. In the Catholic priest who has this day been raised to the fulness of the episcopal order devotion to his native land has ever been a prominent trait. In the high and responsible offices that have been entrusted to him he has never failed to make it plain that he was a profound believer in the fundamental principles that have always regulated the relations of the Catholic Church and the United States, principles of mutual respect and coöperation, a large and kindly amity that recognizes fully the nature and history of each society and emphasizes particularly all those points of contact that make for a deeper intelligence of one another, a fuller sympathy, and a more efficient promotion of the great beneficent aims that are common to both. In his long and successful career in the Eternal City as a representative of the Catholic Church in the United States he was called on more than once to render highly prized services to whole classes of our citizens, while an army of individuals, bishops, priests, and laymen, still live to thank him for innumerable courtesies and benefits conferred on them during the same period. If we consider that the Catholic life flourishes

particularly where good order, venerable tradition, sure and rapid justice, and a general wise equity prevail, it is not too much to say that no priest has contributed more to the welfare both of our clergy and of the Catholic laity in general. Let a partial witness of this be his acknowledged service to the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore and his share in the establishment of the Apostolic Delegation at Washington. The chief merit, however, of this priest's life is the service that he has rendered to the education of the clergy, always a matter of primary importance in the Catholic religion which is kept alive, taught and administered, protected and illustrated chiefly by the ministers whom it selects from its own members and trains with exceedingly great affection and earnestness as the guardians and representatives before God and man of its spirit, its honor and its dignity. As Rector for many years of the American College at Rome he brought that beloved institution to a high degree of academic efficiency and placed it on a sound economic basis whence it has arisen regularly to its present high status. The unification of all our teaching in the annual assemblies of the Catholic Educational Association and the increased interest in the work of the Catholic teacher in the United States are largely due to his intelligent zeal and influence.

Finally, as Rector of the Catholic University of America he has won the support and approval of his superiors, has guided faithfully and successfully that institution amid peculiarly trying and even disheartening circumstances, and has received from the Apostolic See the highest note of recognition that can be conferred on a Catholic priest. More than this it would be unnecessary to say, did not the present magnificent assembly of Catholic prelates, probably the largest ever gathered in this country for an episcopal consecration, demand from us an expression of gratitude. While they have come from far and near primarily to honor the distinguished ecclesiastic who this day enters their high rank we cannot forget that their imposing array, for numbers and dignity, is almost a council of the Church, and that their assembly adds one more title of just

pride to this venerable Cathedral and is one more well-merited joy for the eminent prelate who, more than any one else, rejoices in the happy culmination of the life that he has this day irrevocably consecrated to an absolute service of our Common Master.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

SOCIOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF LYING.

II.

The suggestion made in a preceding article, that one study the lie in its relation to social factors; that one look upon it as a social phenomenon as well as an act of individual morality, leads to a further thought: namely, that one study the lie in relation to the social position of those who resort to it.

The lie in a child is quite unlike the lie in a parent. The lie of one in authority is quite different from the lie of the subject. Motive, process, apology are largely distinct. The psychologist looks upon the child's lie as part of a normal process of development, while the parent or teacher must combat the tendency toward untruthfulness with every means at command. But it is not easy to teach the child how to tell the truth. It discovers and remembers that truthtelling may be punished as well as lie telling and thus gradually inclines to govern statements by their effect on itself and on others rather than by their relation to truth. When the mind has gone through that revolution, it is with difficulty recalled to the straight and narrow way. If the young discover that purity of motive is no defence for telling awkward truth; that honesty of feeling is not a safe guide in polite conversation; that truthful replies to pointed questions are not by any means warranted; that failure to have pleasant things to say is a serious social blunder, they deserve pity in their struggle to work out an honorable code of rules to govern their lives. Being "just at the age twixt boy and youth, when thought is speech and speech is truth" these conflicts between standards which they love and situations which they cannot control, are full of pain and confusion. Possibly even the truthful do not always love the truth. Howells says in "A Modern Instance:" "Few men love the truth for its

sake, and Bartley was not one of these: but he practiced it because his experience had been that lies were difficult to manage, and that they were a burden on the mind. He was not candid: he did not shun evasions, but positive lies he had kept from, and now he could not trust one to save his life."

Once most men unfortunately discover that moderate lying is so easy, so available, so harmless apparently, they are inclined to adopt it as an institution. This inclination is the stronger in proportion as one contrasts the immense latitude of statement secured when one lies, with the particular and narrow exactness that truth imposes. Montaigne notices this in his "Essay on Lyars." "If falsehood had like truth but one face only, we should be on better terms, for we should then take the exact contrary to what the lyar says for certain truth; but the reverse of truth has an hundred thousand figures and a field indefinite without bond or limit." It is true that the young discover, early in life, the penalty for lying and the ideal value of truthfulness, and no doubt, great effort is made toward the nobler practice. But the tendency will remain to find a compromise which will allow more freedom with the truth than our moral codes sanction.

In this manner we might examine the statesman's lie, the servant's lie, the partisan's lie. But it may be as well to study general social traits in relation to lying and to permit the reader to make for himself the application.

I.

A first observation to be made is that on an average we feel a physical recoil against uttering unpleasant truths to those concerned. Let a child have a duty to tell such truth to a parent, or a subject have that duty toward a superior or a friend toward a friend; at once a physical recoil is felt. One looks for ways of evading the task; one seeks some one else who may do it; one delays as long as possible; one thinks out the whole conversation in advance; how much is to be said, how

much hinted, how much omitted. The strength of this recoil varies with temperaments. Some never feel it, some never pay attention to it; nevertheless many do feel it and are controlled by it. Some overcome it and others do not. Nobler natures possibly feel it most and thoughtless or unsympathetic persons feel it least. Enemies escape it in reference to one another, for unpleasant truth is a valuable weapon of offense.

This physical recoil naturally controls one's first impulses when there is question of telling unpleasant truth. Hence arises the prompt inclination to avoid it, which inclination is strengthened by certain virtues and by worldly culture. The tender-hearted, the well-disposed, the charitable feel this recoil doubly because of the very traits which classify them. And culture as it goes, hedges in the telling of unpleasant truth by so many qualifications that these constitute practically a veto on it. "If you cannot be truthful and polite, be at least, polite," says society.

This recoil is felt more or less generally in practically all classes. It is found among those on one social plane, but it is strengthened by changes in social position. Those in authority, if tender-hearted, feel reluctant to say unpleasant truth to subjects because of the added weight which power gives to their words: subjects feel the recoil much more strongly when occasion arises for saying what is unpleasant to superiors. The invention of the court fool for purposes of telling unpleasant truth with impunity was, in very fact, a stroke of genius.

At the outset then one is confronted by this general recoil against speaking unpleasant truth and by variations of it relatively to the social condition of those involved. The recoil is reinforced by culture standards and by aspects of certain virtues. It is related to a complementary trait found everywhere among men, namely constitutional dislike of hearing unpleasant truth. Nothing is more disorganizing, more disturbing than to be compelled to listen to unpleasant truth. Some overcome their revulsion but most men find it extremely difficult to hear without disturbance truth which is unpleasant. It is in many ways, a mental shock which disturbs the mind's balance, blurs its vision and causes marked effect on the emotions.

This is so true that one is actually obliged to apologize for being frank or to ask permission to be so. Pope has told us that blunt truths do more harm than nice falsehoods. Thus truthfulness is a very Cinderella among the virtues.

One sees at a glance what a difficult matter it is to be quite truthful when any truth which is unpleasant causes such a recoil in him who might or ought to speak it and such pain and confusion in him who hears it. If now we look up from the individual to society at large and understand that there is a general social reluctance to speak unpleasant truth and an equally developed social dislike of hearing it, it is clear that any general command to tell the truth will be discounted to a marked degree in actual life.

II.

It is found too that there is among men a marked liking for pleasant sayings, flattery, praise and the like. The psychological process by which this hunger for pleasant sayings is developed lies beyond this discussion. It is quite independent of the merits of the individual. However, he usually does not know this. Now in as far as we may know truthful pleasant things, in so far it is not difficult to tell the truth. But when our supply of truth is exhausted and quite a margin of unsatisfied appetite remains, the pressure to lie is felt. Hence most men mistrust flattery yet in their hearts welcome it, and thus the flattering lie endures. Unfortunately social custom has created definite situations in which we must speak and culture usually asks that we speak pleasantly. Thus we praise the preacher's sermon, the scholar's lecture, the singer's voice, the pretty baby, our neighbor's new house, our artist friend's painting. There is such spirit in the anecdote told of two French ladies who were engaged in denouncing a lecture that they had just heard. The lecturer was seen to approach when one of them remarked "We must give him the alms of a lie." "None can be pleased without praise," says Johnson, "and few can be praised without falsehood."

When therefore speech is called for and nothing pleasant can be truthfully said, one is constrained to speak pleasantly at any cost. One prefers to be truthful but there are penalties; one will give pain, cause enmity, invite odium. In the face of all of this the pleasant lie, admittedly wrong, seems so easy, so merciful, so peace-giving, that it is told and the scene is ended. We read in a recent novel, "I have never lied to a man in my life." Guido answered, "But you have to a woman." "I suppose so," said Guido, "most of us do in moments of enthusiasm." "Are you often enthusiastic," she asked. "No, very rarely. Besides I do not know whether it is worse in a man to tell fibs to please a woman than it is in a woman to disbelieve what an honest man tells her on his word." Thus it is that the poet spoke good morals and poor politics when he said, "I give him joy that's awkward at a lie." The way of the truthteller is, like that of the transgressor, hard.

In view of this dislike of unpleasant truth and of the liking for pleasant untruths, it is evident that the failure to speak the second and the daring to speak the first, very often invite penalties on the speaker. This introduces an added element in the social process of truthtelling. If one feels a recoil against speaking unpleasant truth, and in addition one invites positive punishment in so doing, the temptation to evade or lie is materially strengthened. Similarly if one invites penalty when one fails to say pleasant things, the inclination to lie in saying them is increased. Hence the theologian is wise when instructing us about fraternal correction, for he allows us to determine our conduct by an estimate of probable effects on the hearer of the unpleasant truth to be communicated. "I am not much in the habit of taking admonition with good grace," declared a U. S. Senator recently in a debate. "I have passed the period of admonitions."

III.

There are current in society certain assumptions which are derived from social situations. These constitute elements in the

social mind and affect our statements. It is the situation dominating the individual and not the individual controlling the situation. Thus, it is assumed generally, that an enemy will minimize one's merit and a friend or ally will exaggerate it. Therefore we discount statements of friend or enemy. If an enemy speak exact truth, society still discounts the statement and thus makes it less than truth, if it be in blame, or more than truth if it be in praise. A plain, literally truthful man can hardly become leader in a party or controversy. Loyalty is sometimes placed above truth. A controversialist or party man who always candidly admits all of the good and truth in his opponent will not remain long in power. A striking instance of this is seen in the life of Frederick Dennisen Maurice. It is said that Chinese Gordon destroyed his "usefulness" to the English by his unwillingness to tell the traditional lies that his office called for.

Thus the typical social relations of alliance and conflict among groups, of incorporation of individual and social points of view in one person, gradually give rise, in the give and take of life, to sets of assumptions by which persons are governed in speaking and in hearing or understanding. These assumptions interfere with the simple speaking of truth and give rise to a mental habit of trimming the truth for the sake of effect. Just as the projectile from the gun is affected and its flight modified by air resistance, by its shape, its motion, and gravity, until its resultant path is quite different from that of its initial direction, so the truth meets many forces which modify its path, and unless these are taken into account in uttering it the net result of a simple true statement may be entirely false. The following attributed in a current newspaper, to Mark Twain, expresses the whole thought:

"But I am used to having my statements discounted. My mother began it before I was seven years old. Yet all through my life my facts have had a substratum of truth, and therefore they were not without preciousness. Any person who is familiar with me knows how to strike my average, and therefore knows how to get at the jewel of any fact of mine and dig

it out of its blue clay matrix. My mother knew that art. When I was seven, or eight, or ten, or twelve years old,—along there,—a neighbor said to her:

"Do you ever believe anything that that boy says?"

My mother said, "He is the wellspring of truth; but you can't bring up the whole well with one bucket," and she added, "I know his average, therefore he never deceives me. I discount him thirty per cent. for embroidery, and what is left is perfect and priceless truth, without a flaw in it anywhere."

IV.

Another feature of the problem is found in the lie uttered in defence of legitimate privacy. When one belongs to an impudent and prying generation, one is apt to resort to the lie in self defence. Love of privacy is deep, but social conditions affect privacy extensively. At any rate, family affairs, income, health, plans and ambitions, professional knowledge, secrets entrusted to one, are usually protected by the privacy which culture allows and one may not invade that zone without incurring the charge of impudence. Privacy is of course, the practical social expression of one's individuality. As life becomes more and more socialized, one's privacy is gradually invaded. We become objects of interest to others and they, to us, yet, privacy remains always equally dear to us. Thus result the impudent question and the lie in defence against it. The effect of this invasion is seen more strikingly when we meet individuals whose judgment of the limits of privacy vary. If teacher and pupil disagree about these limits, a lying relation is apt to spring up; if those in authority claim a privacy which the inferior will not recognize, the latter questions and the former lies in self defense. It is said that Labouchere once proposed to the House of Commons that a committee investigate white lies in Parliament, since the ministry used them in self defense against the opposition. Business men in rivalry, diplomats in their zeal for information, men entrusted with important office or missions of great delicacy, and others of similar kinds find their privacy invaded constantly and as

a matter of fact they institutionalize the lie and use it as occasion demands.

Possibly one may take the typical reporter as a symbol of the invasion of the individual's privacy in modern complex society. He must have news; must discover facts of "human interest" to satisfy his employer who in turn must satisfy his public. In self defence against him the average individual has no weapon better than the lie when he desires to protect himself. An interesting illustration is seen in matters related to a woman's age. Such heretofore has been woman's social position that with character, youth and beauty were her chief assets. Art and care might prolong nature's work in her beauty but years advanced in spite of her. Then, no one had a right to ask her age; to ask it amounted to impudence. Many a social student has been compelled to change his schedules on this account. As age becomes a less important factor in woman's life, her reluctance to make it known will decrease and her temptation to lie about it will cease. Richter says somewhere that when one explains guardedly, nothing is more uncivil than to put a new question. When therefore we have a complex social epoch marked by great love of privacy and increasing invasion of it, there is created a social pressure toward lying which can be overcome only by the more gifted and resourceful.

V.

Attention has been directed to the social penalty of telling unpleasant truth and of failing to tell pleasant untruths. The commercial penalties for both courses of action merit notice.

Once society converts industry and trade into a competitive struggle and throws the individual upon his own resources to make a living, the lie appears as a valuable institution and truthfulness is penalized. Business in every form will tend toward a compact organization in which moral bearings of business acts are lost from view. The isolated act, with profit for motive or self interest as a chief consideration, is seen in its single business relation. The considerations which temper

the profit motive tend to weaken; situations constantly arise when the truth might do manifold economic harm and the lie does direct economic good. This pressure toward the lie in business might be neutralized and undoubtedly is resisted, when the parties to business are thoroughly noble or when there are personal relations between them. But the mass and method in modern business tend to depersonalize it. Customer and merchant are strangers. The manufacturer produces not for individuals but for the "market;" the salesman deals with the customer not with a friend.

The thought may be illustrated for instance in the visit of an unknown lady of poor taste but marked pretensions to a salesman in search of a hat. The salesman's income and position depend on his sales. The lady must be suited. She demands it and the salesman's interests require it. The customer dictates combinations in color which will excite only ridicule, and selects a form which is quite unsuited to her. If the salesman tells the truth, he angers his customer, displeases his employer, affects his own income. Rather than do this, he will risk a lie and trust to the hundreds who too will lie kindly to the lady when they see the hat. Williams tells in his studies on Brahmanism that he planted some pipal trees near a market in order to ingratiate himself with the natives. The tree is sacred to them and planting it is an act of religion. But the natives begged him to desist, saying, that since they were compelled to deceive in doing business, the presence of the sacred trees would be a source of worry. A little book entitled "Who Lies" appeared some time ago. In it the story is told of ten men in professions who agreed not to lie for a year. All, it is said, ruined their business. While the impression of the story as a whole is improbable, every incident mentioned is within the range of the probable in every day professional life. So much so that it does not seem extravagant to say that the lie has become a business institution. Not all business is affected but the lie appears to have a well defined place which is quickly discovered by the entirely truthful who attempt to do business.

Advertising, recommendations of goods, statements concern-

ing "marked down" bargains, comparisons between competitors and such features of business life touch on the lie constantly. The salesman who insists on being truthful and accurate in these matters finds life a weary struggle.

VI.

It may be concluded from the foregoing that truthfulness is no easy virtue. Necessary as it is, and primary in its character, an extremely complex and even distressing situation awaits him who would be faithful.

Honesty of feeling is not a safe guide, purity of motive is no security against mistake, truth is not its own apology. That a statement is true gives no warrant that it may be made. If the truth in question is pleasant, it may be stated to one's friend, but possibly it would be an error of judgment to state it to an antagonist. If a statement of unpleasant truth ought to be made, it is easy to make it against an adversary but difficult to make it to a friend. Sometimes one must say the truth and incur penalty when a lie would win prompt reward. Sometimes social situations call for pleasant speech when only pleasant lies are at one's command. Morality on a given occasion says "tell the truth." Culture says "do not." Kindness says "lie." The speaker must find a resultant from the component forces playing on him and only too often the resultant moves in the direction of the lie. And yet one agrees with Henry James in believing that falsehood is "the most contemptible, the least heroic of vices."

It is easy enough to teach the nobility of truthfulness and the degradation of the lie; it is not so easy to teach the telling of the truth concretely. Possibly some progress might be made were we to study the problem from a more personal standpoint. If the individual were to hold himself responsible for all of the lies told to him, on account of his sensitiveness and dislike of unpleasant truth, or on account of his impudence and curiosity, or of his craving for praise and flattery, he might gradually make it possible for those who deal with him to be more truthful.

The whole social situation resolves itself into a question of habit of mind. Most of us believe in truthtelling and hate lies. We have no doubt about the facts of social life which invite lies but we seem to have much doubt about the doctrine on truthtelling which is to guide us. Disagreement is found on all sides. Some give us one definition of a lie, some give us another; some find moderate lying necessary and consequently right; some find lying wrong, but they call necessary lying by another name. Some reach no conclusion, leaving situations to themselves and then, without debate, lie as may be necessary. Strong teaching and touching appeal for truthfulness are not lacking in society. What is lacking is practical understanding of the social processes back of much lying and practical sympathy for those who lie because forced to it by the world about them.

As medical science promises to put an end to yellow fever and malaria by exterminating mosquitoes, so the moralist might exterminate lies by suppressing in those to whom the lies are told their resentment against truth, their impudence and curiosity, their demand that others lie. When truthtelling is made practicable it will flourish. Corneille has pictured for us in his interesting Dorante the methods of the constitutional liar, and Molière has shown us in the career of Alceste the fate of the truthteller. In our own day, Henry James has sketched in his short story "The Liar," the "liar platonic." He is "disinterested, he does n't operate with a hope of gain or with a desire to injure. It is art for art and he is prompted by the love of beauty." Literature has not failed to take note of this great feature of life yet it is difficult to see that we make much headway against the forces that perpetuate the standard forms of untruthfulness. Extended comment on the sociological lessons in these works might be a real contribution to the discussion of our problem. The social setting of the lie, its fundamental relation to social processes, is well brought out in the following from Spencer's *Principles of Sociology,* Vol. II, Part IV, Ch. XII.

"War of necessity cultivates deception; ambush, manœuvering, feints and the like, involve acted lies; and skillful lying

by actions is regarded as a trait of military genius. The slavery which successful war establishes implies daily practice in duplicity. Against the anger of his cruel master, a successful falsehood is the slave's defense. Under tyrants unscrupulous in their exactions, skillful lying is a means of salvation and a source of pride. And all the ceremonies which accompany the régime of compulsory coöperation are pervaded by insincerity; the fulsome laudations are not believed by the utterer; he feels none of that love for his superior which he professes; nor is he anxious for his welfare as his words assert. But in proportion as compulsory coöperation is replaced by voluntary coöperation, the temptations to deceive that penalties may be escaped, become less strong and perpetual, and simultaneously truthfulness is fostered, since voluntary coöperation can increase only as fast as mutual trust increases. Though throughout the activities of industry there yet survives much of the militant untruthfulness; yet, on remembering that only by daily fulfillment of contracts can these activities go on, we see that in the main, the things promised are performed. And along with the spreading truthfulness thus implied, there goes on an increasing dislike of the more extreme untruthfulness implied in the forms of propitiation. Neither in word nor in act do the professed feelings so greatly exceed the real feelings." The relations of language and lying will be treated in a concluding article.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

DIDACTIC MATERIALISM AND THE TEACHING OF RELIGION.

"Wherever and whenever Christian truth was taught, regard was had also to the right form of teaching. Not the doctrine alone, but also the teaching of the Divine Saviour was held to be the model," declared Dr. Otto Willmann in the opening address at the Catechetical Congress of Munich, 1905. The Encyclical 'Æterni Patris' called our attention to the 'perennis philosophia.' Now parallel with this perennis philosophia must be placed the 'perennis pædagogica.'[1] The same well-known Catholic pedagogue, arguing against Dilthey of Berlin, follows the same line of thought in the words: "Christian pedagogical wisdom contains the leading lines of scientific pedagogy . . . True science wears not the garb of its time, it searches for that which holds for all time, wisely instructed it springs forth from the eternal."[2]

Guided by this truth, we well may adopt the pedagogical language and experience of our time, still keeping in mind the dictum of St. Vincent of Lerins: *Dicas nove, non dicas nova.* Speaking, therefore, in broad terms the Catholic Church recognizes no 'new education.' We shall not allow ourselves to be misled by that American educator, who in an unguarded moment declared that all there is to the science of education could be learned in an hour and a half. On the other hand, as we are striving for a *Catholic* education, we may not reject even the most insignificant kernels of pedagogical truth, though they may be found in books and deeds of non-Catholic educators. We may safely affirm that to these minds also we shall give in return a hundredfold more than we received. The writer heartily endorses Dr. Shields' contention in the March number of the CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY BULLETIN, "No earnest student . . . can fail to notice the wide chasm which separates

[1] *Der Muenchener Katechetische Kurs*, 1905. p. 23.
[2] *Aus Hoersaal und Schulstube*, 1904. p. 40.

current methods of teaching catechism from the method of teaching religion which is embodied in the life of the Church, in her sacramental system, in her liturgy, in her worship and in the practice which she enjoins." Not the Catholic Church, but individual teachers of religion, have permitted themselves to ignore the true Catholic method of teaching religion.

DIDACTIC MATERIALISM.

To use an expression, coined by the German pedagogue Doerpfeld, the defects in the method of Christian Doctrine may be briefly comprised under the general term, "Didactic Materialism." Moreover, not only our method but also our catechisms, and frequently our courses of study—if they exist at all—suffer from this same materialism.

This didactic materialism is no special pedagogical theory, it is a peculiar lack of pedagogical knowledge. It is superficiality incarnate. The silent supposition that the memorized text of the catechism, mechanically and verbally rolled off at examination or confirmation, or for that matter, daily in class, constitutes the religious education of mind and heart, is a delusion all too prevalent among us. It is dermatoplastic skill, applied to the method of Christian Doctrine. The true problem of the educative process in Christian Doctrine is the question how religion shall become *a power in the mind and heart and will.*

ITS EXTENT.

How far this didactic materialism extends in our Catholic schools, the writer cannot state in positively definite terms. But he is fully aware that it still exists to a very great extent. So far his own observation carries him. For the rest, he may well accept the statements in the Reports of Superintendents, Rev. Thomas Devlin and Rev. James F. Nolan, as quoted in the March number of the BULLETIN. Furthermore, the discussions at the annual meetings of the Catholic Educational Association have brought out the same fact. Had there not existed a genuine need of such a work as *The Course of Christian Doctrine* (Dolphin Press), it would not have been published. The writer's personal experience, observation, and inquiry confirm him in this opinion.

IT IS NOT RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

Doerpfeld in his work *Der didaktische Materialismus* (5th ed.), refers in striking words to this abuse in didactic methods. He says (p. 7): "The correct didactic method, which is founded on psychology, teaches that, for education there are necessary other teaching operations besides merely presenting the matter and impressing it on the mind, and that these other operations are at the same time necessary, in order to obviate a mere mechanical impression and in order to make the impression at all fruitful . . . Didactic materialism does not see this; therefore it uses the time necessary for these operations for the mere absorbing of the text-matter." And then he goes on to say how well pleased a teacher following his method really is when he can present a school drilled in this way, but how severely a real teacher suffers when he is forced to follow a course of study, outlined in this gross material manner. The true educator knows well that this method leaves only a lifeless mass of fragments in the child's mind. Truly this is not education, and above all it is not a religious education.

This process, if you will, trains verbal memory. More often, it seems to the writer, it kills or dulls the faculty of memory. The child has no interest in instruction of this sort; the result —within the writer's own experience—is dullards. In the earlier years of his priesthood the writer had ample occasion to observe this process. He well remembers how it occasioned a constant use of the ferule in school, dissatisfaction at home, a dislike for religion, among boys especially, a constant worry for the teachers, loss of precious time and energy, friction among teachers, superiors and parents. In other countries teachers of religion in larger industrial centers attribute religious defection and the spread of infidelity, in part at least, to defective methods of teaching Christian Doctrine. The writer has often wondered if this has been, or is, in part true in the United States. He has no data to fall back on. He merely raises the question. But whether this is so or not, we are, as Catholic teachers, in conscience bound to use the best possible methods in our Catholic schools, and one of these assuredly is not didactic materialism.

AN OBJECTION. SHORTER CATECHISMS.

The saying *Tantum scimus, quantum memoria tenemus* is quite true. Religious education is indeed based on the *scire*, but it culminates in the *velle* and the *agere*. *Christus fecit et docuit.* We are Christians not because of the *scire* alone, but more because of the *velle*. And besides we retain things in our memories without always drilling the memory. Memory and memorizing are not equivalent. Mere verbal memorizing has not yet produced a single Christian. A definition of contrition has not as yet made a single convert. Verbal memorizing, as carried on in so many schools, has little educative religious value. It is of importance, at most, in preserving for a time the correct expressions for religious truths; the content of Christian Doctrine remains as easily in our memories *without verbal memorizing*. It is true that this content should remain for life, but it is quite unnecessary that it should be couched in the exact form of catechism. Only persons of rarely retentive memories will in later years remember catechetical definitions. It is the writer's firm belief—his daily experience teaches him—that the memory-matter of our catechisms could with the greatest profit be reduced to about one fourth of the usual amount. Continental catechetical writers and reformers confirm this same statement. That is the reason why the new catechisms in Europe are so short. History teaches that the shortest catechisms were longest in use. St. Alphonsus Liguori wrote a catechism of about eight pages. The brief '*Institutiones christianæ pietatis, seu catechismus parvus*' of St. Peter Canisius was used for 200 years. "Our old Canisius" became a proverb in Germany.

An infidel educator, speaking of the didactical make-up of some of our elementary catechisms has dubbed them 'the purest Bethlehemitic child-murder.' But, then, our Catholic pedagogues, once they realize the meaning of didactic materialism, will concede almost as much.

RE-FORM OF CATECHISM.

Speaking of the form of the catechism, we must on reflection be amazed that it has not been re-formed long ago, considering the wonderful progress of typography and the illustrative arts. The Readers in our schools are the

best on the market; witness especially the Benziger *New Century Readers.* Now the catechism is incomparably a holier and grander book that the *Reader*—and yet, what is it even in exterior appearance? We are clamoring for objective methods, and the objective exterior form of the catechism remains—truly execrable. Our bible-histories are not a whit better. Illustrations in them are as a rule an objective parody on the printer's art. The first Canisius (1555) contained four wood-cuts, other editions 20, 50, 100, Linden's has 12, the Augsburg catechism 41 pictures, the Piedmont and Lombard catechism 62 full-page illustrations. Father Yorke's and Father Klauder's revised Baltimore catechisms are the only exceptions we know of in this country. And yet, the catechism should of all the books in our schools be best in didactic form and foremost in outward appearance. Our Catholic pedagogues and our publishing houses have here a fertile field, and one that will abundantly repay, even financially.

As Dr. Shields points out in the article to which reference has already been made, we are at variance with the historic practice of the Church. We could almost construct our catechisms from the frescoes, found in the Roman catacombs of the second century. What of the *Biblia Pauperum* in the Middle Ages, what of the Christian art, as expressed on the walls of our medieval cathedrals, in the very liturgical system of the Church? Religious dramas were really acted in former ages in the churches themselves! And then, every schoolboy knows of the Passion Play. The methods in use to-day are not those of the Catholic Church! Dr. Waal (*Roma Sacra,* 1905, p. 98) has this to say: "The frescoes in the catacombs present to us a picture catechism, that renders clear the most important doctrinal truths of Christianity; they are pictures sprung from the first warm life of the Church, flowers sprinkled with the blood of martyrs!"

True Catechetical Method.

What should be, in general outlines, the true method of Christian Doctrine? Komensky (Comenius) or Pestalozzi need not be our models. We have a Divine Pedagogue, Christ Himself. It is true He did not instruct

children—yet his hearers were very child-like, indeed. His teaching was pre-eminently objective. The writer may be permitted to quote a Protestant work '*The Blackboard in Sunday School,* (H. T. Bailey, ch. II), because it puts the matter lucidly and is unobjectionable from a Catholic view-point:

"I. *Learning is dependent upon interest and attention.*

"How well Jesus knew this! What tact He displayed in arresting and holding attention! He came to Nazareth, where He had been brought up, and, as His custom was, went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day and stood up and read. He read a perfectly familiar passage of Scripture, but *stopped in the middle of a sentence,* closed the book, gave it to the minister, and sat down. Could anything be better calculated to attract attention? 'This day is the Scripture fulfilled in your ears.' He won Nathanael for life by two shrewd observations; the woman of Samaria by the commonplace request for a drink of water. Nicodemus was interrupted in the midst of his complimentary preamble and turned toward the way of life by the startling announcement, 'Ye must be born again.' The disciples were recalled from their fishing . . . by obeying so simple a command as 'Cast the net on the right side.' In each case an appropriate but unexpected word awakened genuine interest and prepared the mind for knowledge. . . . .

"II. *Ideas must be taught by means of their appropriate objects.*

"Jesus knew that 'actions speak louder than words' . . . When poor, discouraged, imprisoned John sent two of his disciples to inquire, 'Art thou He that should come?' Luke says that in the same hour Jesus, instead of saying the simple word *Yes,* cured many of their infirmities, and plagues, and of evil spirits, and unto many that were blind He gave sight. *Then* answering, He said unto them, 'Go your way and tell John what things ye have seen and heard!' 'Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?' asked the disciples. And Jesus called a little child unto Him and set Him in the midst of them. 'What thinkest thou,' asked the

Herodians, 'Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar?' 'Show me the tribute money,' said Jesus. 'Whose image and superscription is this?' When He would teach the greatness of service He took a towel and girded Himself and *afterward* said, 'If I, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to serve one another.'

"III. *Never tell a pupil what he may wisely be led to see for himself.*

"No one ever applied this rule so well as the Master. 'Where dwellest thou?' asked the disciples of John. 'Come and see,' was the reply. A certain lawyer stood up, to test Him, saying, 'Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?' Jesus said, 'What is written in the law? How readest thou?' Certainly no one should know the law better than a lawyer! The lawyer was made to answer his own question; but he, willing to justify himself, said, 'And who is my neighbor?' Again Jesus led him to furnish the correct answer, this time by passing judgment upon the case of a man who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho and fell among thieves. When Simon the Pharisee was mistaken as to the chief sinner at His feet, Jesus told a story, as Nathan did before David, and after securing right judgment upon a supposed case, turned upon Simon with a 'Thou art the man.' . . . .

"IV. *Proceed from the known to the related unknown.*

"Think how He applied this rule in the sermon on the Mount! After securing the attention of the multitudes by eight beatitudes diametrically opposed to all their ideas of earthly happiness, He proceeded to lead their thought from common salt and its well-known properties to the unappreciated characteristics of a genuine saint, and from the most obvious facts about candles and cities to the conditions of Christian living. Then follow five sections beginning, 'Ye have heard.' From the known tradition He makes the transition by the words, 'But *I* say unto you,' to the new related truth. From what they had known of the law he passed to what they knew of life. He instanced the ostentatious alms-givers, praying and fasting hypocrites, grinding money-grabbers, time-servers, people possessed with the devil worry,

lazybones, pious professors, and the like, and from the well-known failings of each He led to the hitherto unknown related truths of the spiritual life.

"V. *Correlate with the life of the pupil.*

"This was the habit of the Master, so well known to His disciples that when on one occasion He remarked, 'Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees,' they reasoned among themselves, saying, 'It is because we have taken *no* bread.' The incidents of daily life furnished occasion for presenting truth at the most opportune moment. It was while they were fishing that Jesus called Peter and Andrew to be fishers of men. To the woman drawing water at the well of Samaria He presented Himself as the water of life. The hunger of the disciples, and its immediate consequences one Sabbath morning, gave us the most important commentary we have upon the nature of the Christian Sabbath. . . ."

Now, no true pedagogue will in this quotation see the complete method of Christian Doctrine. These are only in part its psychological conditions. Christ did not teach systematically a definite number of pupils, save His disciples, and those mostly apart from the multitudes. Besides, and this is important to keep in mind, He did not have before Him disciples uninstructed in religion. They were well versed in the traditions of the synagogue and in the Mosaic Law. We, in the school-rooms, have a completely different task; we have to teach pupils from the earliest childhood, and mostly such as bring with them no stock of religious knowledge. Again, psychology is not the only auxiliary science of pedagogy; there are others in addition to it.

There can be no undogmatic Christianity. The dogmatic form of the Apostles' Creed dates back into the second century, even according to Harnack. We cannot completely abolish abstract formulæ in our catechisms. The human mind will finally express religious facts in exact dogmatic language. A more or less abstract catechism we must always have. It also has its educational value as Father Yorke well showed last year at the Milwaukee meeting of the Catholic Educational

Association. Nevertheless, we are on perfectly safe ground when we say with Dr. Krieg (*Katechetik,* 1907; II, p. 176) that catechism is only a literary help. The *catechist* is sent by the Church to teach, *not the book. Fides ex auditu.*

THE MUNICH METHOD.

The catechist must teach and educate. Therefore he must know how to educate. He must know the complete method. The *donum didacticum* is rare enough. The catechist must study and learn the method. He must gauge his method both by the subject and by the object, both by the child and by the matter-content. His teaching must be pedagogically correct, therefore logical and psychological. To the writer's mind the best and most fully developed catechetical method is contained in the works of the Munich catechists. Reserving the Bibliography of this school of catechetical thought for a future article it may suffice to give here a succinct account of this method frequently called the Psychological Method of Christian Doctrine. In this method as cultivated, spread and perfected chiefly by the Munich Catechetical Society, several psychological elements are synthesized into one catechetical unit, to be used in each school-hour. Out of this synthesis result several catechetical questions and answers, which are, however, already intelligible to the pupils and are therefore, we may say, gathered as ripe fruit (Meyenberg). The *Aim* of the lesson is first brought out very briefly; then follows a *Preparation* which rapidly reviews former lessons or simply leads to the new; upon this follows the *Presentation* of the subject-matter in the shape of one story, or any other one objective fact, or any appropriate object-lesson; the subsequent *Explanation,* regard being had to the catechism questions, lifts out of the objective presentation in vivid colors the catechetical concepts. The catechist then proceeds to the *Combination* of all the gathered concepts—in the words of the catechism. Finally he puts the practical central *Application,* which ought to be a supernatural schooling of conscience. This method is therefore a *genetic synthesis,* founded upon formal psychological steps.—Of course, no one, not even the most ardent promoters, knowing man's fallen nature, can or do expect infallible results from method. Still this one is

unquestionably grounded and built on admitted psychological processes, and as such invites intelligent study.

DIDACTIC FORMALISM.

But while we are bound to follow true Catholic educational methods, we may not be hasty in lauding the 'new education,' or one-sided in the adoption of every supposedly accepted result of modern pedagogical research. Dr. Horne, of Dartmouth College, in his work *The Psychological Principles of Education,* 1906, pp. 320, 321, is candid enough to warn us against the dangers of this 'new education.' A certain flabbiness of character will result from a one-sided application of exclusively psychological principles in pedagogy. This is the danger prevalent in American methods of to-day. On the other hand, a certain severity of character, a narrowness, seem to Dr. Horne to have been the result of the old school which chiefly cultivated effort. A true method will be a judicious blending of all—interest, associations, objectivity—and, in addition, well-directed effort. That is the reason why Dr. Willmann is so insistent on the objective value of truth in education. Not subject alone, object also has its laws, its worth. We have had too much subjectivism in modern education.

The study of the psychological process in the true educative method must not overshadow the objective point of view; we may not without grave danger underestimate the importance of the objects of study *in se.* Speaking with Dr. Willmann, we may not elevate into the only valid form this formal maxim: "Instruct so, that the soul-activity will be increased, uplifted and ennobled." In this there lies a 'didactic formalism;' it overlooks the fact that we learn also in order *to understand and be able to act,* and that the contents of knowledge have their own laws, in the acknowledgment of which there lies a goodly part of moral agencies. The falsehood of rationalistic pedagogy arises from the lowering of the value of science *in se.* These pedagogues forget to acknowledge the objective truth in itself, but only educate and entertain the learning subject. Respect for objective truth, its eternity and its organism is neglected. (*Didaktik,* II, 62).

We are thankful to the disciples of Herbart, for never ceas-

ing to accentuate the higher meaning of education, the formation of character. With them we must be ever enhancing our knowledge of psychological processes. In the reaction against materialism lies the strength of this so-called 'new education.' However, all reform, to be lasting must follow objective truth, which has laws of its own. Again, Catholic pedagogy far surpasses the aim of the Herbartians. Our aim is not virtue for its own sake. For us, morality cannot be separated from religion. Union with God, not only a likeness to God, is the last aim of our Christian education.

THE TEACHER THE BEST METHOD.

We know that grace does not destroy nature. Therefore we must also make use of natural means and motives in education. But we may not forget the supernatural. Here the 'new education' ceases. The true teacher not only employs the best natural methods; he must be the best natural and supernatural method in himself. He is the greatest natural and supernatural objective help in education—his own example is the truest method. And we could not put it more forcibly than Dr. Bilczewski, Archbishop of Lemberg, has expressed it at the last Catechetical Congress of Vienna: "In spirit bent on his knees will the teacher of religion, like another Fra Angelico, draw the ideal picture of Christ and His Holy Mother. And if he should not be able to awaken in his disciples more admiration and love for the Person of the God-man and the Heavenly Queen than the best professor can awaken for a Goethe . . . . then God did not call him to the teacher's chair."

FRANCIS L. KERZE.

CLEVELAND, OHIO.

PROFESSOR BACON AND THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

In a recent issue of *The Hibbert Journal,* an article, entitled "The 'Defence' of the Fourth Gospel," has appeared from the pen of Professor Bacon, Yale University. As probably not many of your readers will have seen the article, I may explain that it purports to defend the Fourth Gospel against those writers who maintain the Johannine authorship of the Gospel, but decline to admit its historical character. A very prominent English scholar, Dr. Drummond, is singled out for special attack, and is accused of maintaining the traditional authorship at the expense of St. John's veracity. This serious charge is based upon the fact that Dr. Drummond regards the account of the raising of Lazarus as unhistorical, and is inclined to believe that St. John deliberately invented the story 'as a pictorial embodiment of spiritual truth.'[1] I am not concerned to defend Dr. Drummond, who is well able to take care of himself; but I may be permitted to point out that it is hardly fair, in the circumstances, to represent him as questioning St. John's veracity. Surely a man may hold that St. John's Gospel is allegorical in whole or part without thereby accusing the Evangelist of untruth or insincerity. And this is exactly Dr. Drummond's position. He tells us that in his view St. John "deliberately departed from the current tradition, and with full consciousness of what he was about, produced his spiritual Gospel. Nevertheless, we must suppose that he wrote in all good faith, for the notion of imposture in connection with such a work cannot be entertained."[2]

But, as I have said, I am not concerned to defend Dr. Drummond; I desire rather to examine Professor Bacon's own position. The Professor rejects the traditional view as to the

[1] Drummond, *The Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel.* p. 426.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 429.

authorship of the Gospel, asserts that it "makes no claim to be from the hand of John," and maintains that it is only brought into connection with the Apostle's name by means of an Epilogue (xxi. 24) commonly acknowledged to have been attached at a later time by another and unknown writer.[3] Having thus, as by a wave of his hand, brushed aside all the evidence, internal and external, except that of the Epilogue, he soon disposes of it too by the simple method of declaring it erroneous. It would have been very interesting to learn from him how an erroneous ascription to an apostle of a work so important and vital as the Fourth Gospel, could have been at once so universally accepted, but he has somehow forgotten to discuss this point. Even if we granted that his "Redactor," the alleged author of the Epilogue, was "a contemporary of Papias, Polycarp and Justin," we might still ask how could an erroneous ascription of the Gospel to the Apostle John be allowed to pass unchallenged at such a date. Many of the Apostle's disciples must have been still alive at Ephesus, when the Gospel appeared there, and is there not just a little difficulty in supposing that they tamely allowed a work so strange and unlike the Synoptics to be falsely fathered upon their great master? About such a work they cannot possibly have been indifferent, and its apparent conflict with the Synoptic tradition would have been bound to make them deny its Johannine authorship unless they were really convinced that it was the Apostle's work. Even if we supposed them indifferent on the Gospel's first appearance, later on when the Gnostics and Montanists were abusing the work to support their errors, would there have been no voice except the feeble note of the shadowy Alogi raised to question its apostolic authorship? If the critics who ascribe the Epilogue to a Redactor will face these questions squarely, I think they shall find that other views besides the traditional one are open to serious difficulties, and they may even come to realise that its difficulties, though not inconsiderable, are incomparably less than those involved in any other hypothesis.

[3] Cf. *Hibbert Journal*, Oct., 1907, p. 118.

But it is chiefly with Professor Bacon's treatment of the other claims of the Johannine writings to apostolic authorship that I desire to deal. In the article referred to, he not only endeavors to explain away the passages commonly regarded as indicating that the writer was an eyewitness of Christ's ministry, but implies that we have no right to look for such indications in a work like the Fourth Gospel. If we are to believe him, the author of the Gospel was too spiritual, too much of the true Christian gnostic, to attach any importance to the question whether or not he had been an eye-witness. "According to Theologos," [4] he writes, "there is no need for Christians to be disputing about the length of life of this 'witness of Messiah' or that. With Paul he holds that it is not physical but spiritual contact that gives apostolic authority. The Logos is with them alway, even unto the end of the world. Because his life is in them, they are witnesses that taste not of death till his *parousia*." [5] And in the immediate context, he goes on to quote several passages from the first Epistle of St. John, about the meaning of which I shall have something to say later on, which apparently seem to him to prove conclusively that the writer lays no claim to having been an eye-witness. Then he proceeds triumphantly: "This is the 'witness.' To talk as if it were something which none but the first generation can render, with mere tales about their experiences of the physical senses, is to force upon the writer as his only meaning the 'witness of men,' when he insists upon testifying by the 'witness of God which is greater.' This apostolic succession he belongs to and would extend." [6]

If, then, we point to certain passages of the Fourth Gospel or first Epistle of St. John as indicating that their author claims to have been an eye-witness of Christ's public life and, therefore, a man of the first Christian generation, we are met with the reply that this is an utter misunderstanding of these texts, the true meaning being that the author was a Christian

[4] Theologos is the title the Professor gives to his unknown author of the Gospel.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 129.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 130.

teacher in "living, conscious contact with the spiritual Logos." If we urge that the language of the passages, as, for instance, when it is said: The Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us, and we beheld His glory," or: "That which we have seen with our eyes, that which he beheld and our hands handled concerning the Word of life . . . . that which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us"—if, I say, we urge that such language is inconsistent with mere spiritual or mystical vision of Christ, our contention is admitted, and indeed cannot be denied, but we are told in the same breath that we must not therefore conclude that the writer was an eye-witness. No, he is only a Christian teacher of a later generation, but he speaks in the name of Christians generally, the first generation of whom were eye-witnesses. Thus, we are asked to believe that: "The witness is historical in its source, but personal and immediate in its verification. The record is confirmed by the experience; and the experience therefore makes later generations fellow-witnesses with the first." On no account, however, are we to look upon the witness "as if it were something which none but the first generation can render, with mere tales about their experiences of the physical senses," for with Paul the author of the Gospel "holds that it is not physical but spiritual contact that gives Apostolic authority." [7]

From all this it is clear Professor Bacon holds that no special weight is to be attached to the testimony of eye-witnesses of Christ's life; Ephesian teachers of the second century, inasmuch as they are successors of St. Paul, "the Apostle of the present, spiritual Christ" were as competent as any apostle to bear witness to Jesus and His Gospel. The inference implied is that we have no right to expect in the Fourth Gospel or first Epistle of St. John any indication that the author had been an eye-witness. As this position underlies much of Professor Bacon's argument in the article I am examining, let us look at it a little more closely.

In the first place, where does St. Paul state or imply "that

[7] *Ibid.* pp. 129, 130.

it is not physical but spiritual contact that gives apostolic authority?" The Professor does not deign to give any references, but I will supply him with one or two that prove the very contrary. When St. Paul is defending to the Corinthians his claim to apostleship, he writes: "Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" And lest the Professor should possibly reply that there is question only of spiritual or mystical vision, I refer him to Acts xxvi, 16, where Paul relates to King Agrippa how Jesus had appeared to him and said to him: "Arise and stand upon thy feet; for to this end have I appeared unto thee, to appoint thee a minister and a witness both of the things wherein thou hast seen me and of the things wherein I will appear unto thee." From both these texts it is perfectly clear that St. Paul connected his warrant to bear authoritative witness to the Gospel with the fact that he had seen Jesus, and enjoyed those very "experiences of the physical senses," at which the Professor sneers. Some other sanction, therefore, than St. Paul's must be sought for the view that merely spiritual contact gives apostolic authority. And it must be sought elsewhere than in the New Testament; for the New Testament makes it abundantly clear that those who were chosen as the specially accredited witnesses of Christ and His Gospel, had, and were required to have, more than spiritual contact with Jesus. Thus, when there was question of appointing another Apostle to fill the place of the traitor, St. Peter made it clear that he should be one who had more than spiritual contact with Christ: "Of the men, therefore, who have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John unto the day that He was received up from us, of these one must become a witness with us of His resurrection."[8] And from the Fourth Gospel itself we learn that on the night before His death Jesus emphasised the fact that the apostles were to be His witnesses because they had been His companions: "But when the Paraclete is come, whom I will send you from the Father, he shall bear witness of Me, and ye also shall bear

[8] Acts, I, 21, 22.

witness, *because ye are with me from the beginning.*" [9] This does not read as if merely "spiritual contact" gave apostolic authority; and it may be noted, too, how in this text the witness of the Spirit does not exclude that of the apostles; both are to exist side by side.

It is beyond question, then, that Jesus Christ appointed certain witnesses to Himself and the Gospel, because, among other reasons, they had been His companions, and eye-witnesses of His ministry. No doubt a day was to come when the apostles should go the way of all flesh, and their work be taken up by others, who would carry it on successfully, though they never beheld Jesus with the eyes of the body. In the second century, as in the twentieth, every Christian teacher was in his measure a witness to Jesus and the Gospel; but it remains true that the apostles were specially authorised witnesses, possessing authority and credentials possessed neither by the teachers of the twentieth century nor by those of the second.

But if the apostles were thus specially authorised witnesses, authorised too because they were eye-witnesses of Christ's life and death and resurrection, and if the Apostle John lived in Ephesus about the time when the Fourth Gospel and first Epistle of John appeared, there is at least a presumption that the passages in these works, which seem to claim for the writer the authority of an eye-witness, may really come from the Apostle's hand. Such a presumption cannot be lightly brushed aside on the grotesque ground that we have no right to expect, even in the writings of apostles, any reference to their "experiences of the physical senses." On the contrary, such reference would be perfectly natural and might even be expected from an aged apostle writing at the end of the first century, when most of the other eye-witnesses of Christ's life were gone, and when the reference, besides refreshing his own heart with the memory of the glorious past, would at the same time serve to remind his readers of his apostolic authority. If in addition to this, we find that tradition unanimously ascribed these writings to the Apostle John, we have a strong confirmation of the

[9] J. xv, 26, 27.

presumption that the passages in which the writer seems to speak as an eye-witness, are really appeals to his past experiences as an apostle.

Let us, therefore, now proceed to examine the passages in question. Dr. Sanday, in *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel,* a work made up of lectures delivered some years ago in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, had appealed to three passages as directly indicating that the author of the Johannine writings was an eye-witness: 1 J., I, 1-4; J., I, 14; XIX, 35. These Professor Bacon takes up in succession, and apparently succeeds in explaining away to his own entire satisfaction. Let us see, however, whether his explanations are really satisfactory. In 1 John I, 1-4 we read: "That which was from the beginning, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld and our hands handled, concerning the Word of life (and the life was manifested, and we have seen, and bear witness, and declare unto you the life, the eternal life, which was with the Father and was manifested unto us); that which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us; yea, and our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ; and these things we write that your joy may be fulfilled." As Dr. Sanday justly remarks, the *prima facie* view of this passage undoubtedly is that the writer is speaking as one of a group of eye-witnesses. Of mere mystical vision there cannot be question; it is excluded by *ἐθεασάμεθα,* by the remarkable expression: "that which we beheld and our hands handled," and indeed by the whole tenor of the passage. There is reference, therefore, to the "experiences of the physical senses," as even Professor Bacon here seems to admit. "Certainly," he writes, "Theologos emphasises the visibility and *tangibility* of the incarnation of the Logos." [10] The only question then is, Who is it that thus refers to these experiences of the physical senses? We, in conformity with an age-long tradition, say it is the Apostle John, who uses what we may call the editorial 'we' either to refer to his own experiences or to include the other apostles

[10] *Ibid.* p. 128.

with himself as the specially accredited witnesses of Jesus. There can be no doubt whatever that this is the natural and *prima facie* view of the passage; and when we find it in complete harmony with tradition, and confirmed not only by particular passages of the Fourth Gospel but by a multitude of details that seem to point with certainty to the author as an eye-witness,[11] there can be just as little doubt about its being also the correct view.

But how does Professor Bacon understand the passage? He holds that the writer was some unknown Ephesian disciple of St. Paul, who had never seen Christ, but who speaks in the name of Christians generally, or rather of the Christian teachers of Ephesus. At once one is tempted to ask, how could the Christian teachers of Ephesus in the second century speak of having seen with their eyes, and beheld, and handled with their hands the Word of life; and the Professor's reply is that not they but the first generation of Christians had these experiences; but because they were Christians, like the first generation, successors too of St. Paul, "the Apostle of the present, spiritual Christ," and had spiritual experience of the reality of the Incarnation, they were entitled to use such language: "The witness is historical in its source, but personal and immediate in its verification. The record is confirmed by the experience, and the experience therefore makes subsequent generations fellow-witnesses with the first."[12] A delightful explanation, surely! So the teachers of Ephesus, who had never seen Christ, are to be understood as bearing witness to Him in virtue of their spiritual experiences, and they bear this witness for the benefit of the readers of the Epistles, in order that these may have their joy fulfilled (I, 4) and may not sin (II, 1). But what if the readers of 1 John were also themselves in "spiritual contact" with Christ, and enjoyed these spiritual experiences, and were, therefore, by the Professor's own showing, fellow-witnesses with the first generation? If we turn to the Epistles, we find that its readers are "dear children" (II,

[11] See *Irish Theological Quarterly*, April, 1908.
[12] *Ibid.* p. 129

1, 18, etc.), and "know the truth" (II, 21) and "are of God" and have "conquered Antichrist," because God or the Spirit is in them (IV, 4). Surely such readers are supposed to be in "spiritual contact" with Christ and to enjoy spiritual experiences, and the question urges itself upon us: What special "witness" could the Professor's Ephesian teachers, who had never seen Christ, bear for such readers? In the light of his views about witness, none whatever: the readers were as capable of bearing witness as the writer or writers. Thus, the Professor's theory fails absolutely to give any reason for the distinction emphasised throughout the whole Epistle between the writer and his readers, or to account for the fact that the writer claims to be able to bear solemn and most emphatic witness, while his readers are supposed to be incapable of bearing any such witness themselves, and are expected to profit by the authoritative witness he bears (II, 4; V, 13). All this is perfectly intelligible if the writer was an apostle who had companied with the Word made flesh, beheld His glory as in the transfiguration, and gazed upon Him risen from the dead—the witness of such a man was something very special, and might well be expected to confirm the faith of his readers—but an Ephesian teacher of the second century could lay no claim to bearing such special witness, nor indeed, if the Professor's view of what constitutes apostolic witness were correct, to adding anything to the "experience" of readers who were already in "spiritual contact" with Christ.

Throughout the whole of the first Epistle of St. John, there is absolutely nothing that in any way weakens the force of what I have said or contributes in the smallest degree to show that the witness of the opening verses is other than apostolic. It is true, the Professor cites together separate verses of the Epistle: IV, 13, 14; V, 6, 9-12, and without condescending to examine them, triumphantly concludes that they prove they witness of the opening verses of the Epistle to be such as he maintains. As he has not ventured to discuss the verses in their context or show how they support his view, I might dispense myself from examining them, but I will endeavour to point out in a few words their true meaning. In IV, 13;

"Hereby we (ἡμεῖς is not in the original) know that we abide in Him and He in us, because He hath given us of His Spirit," the apostle is speaking in the name of all christians; but, as is obvious, the statement he makes has nothing to do with the character of the witness borne in the Epistle.

In the following verse: "And we (ἡμεῖς) have beheld and bear witness that the Father hath sent His Son to be the Saviour of the world," he is speaking in his own person, and solemnly witnessing to the Incarnation and Redemption. The change of subject is plainly suggested by the use of ἡμεῖς in the second instance; in the two preceding verses where there is question of all Christians, the pronoun is not read in the original. And if the pronoun is expressed in reference to all Christians in IV, 10, 11, this is to mark the pointed antithesis between them with God: "Not that *we* loved God, but that He loved *us*"[13] The witness of verse 14, therefore, is not that of all Christians, nor even of all Ephesian teachers, but as in the opening verses of the Epistle, and for the reasons already set forth, the witness of the apostle.

The remaining verses appealed to by the Professor, are contained in the difficult passage V, 6-12, the famous passage of the Three Witnesses. From these obscure verses one idea emerges clearly, that the Holy Spirit, with the water and the blood, bore witness to Christ, while He was on earth, and that "he who believeth in the Son of God hath the witness in him" (V, 10). The Professor evidently concludes from this that he who believes in the Son of God, has the present witness of the Holy Spirit in him, in the sense that being in "spiritual contact" with Christ and enlightened by the Holy Ghost, he can bear witness himself, and needs no apostolic tales about "experiences of the physical senses" to confirm his own faith or that of his disciples. It is hardly necessary to point out that the real meaning of the phrase: "hath the witness in him," is entirely different. The true and only possible sense of the passage is, that he who believes in the Son of God, thereby accepts and adheres to the witness borne to Him while on earth

[13] Cf. IV, 4, 6.

by the Holy Spirit.[14] Not one of these texts, then, is in the slightest degree to the point, or tends in the least to support the Professor's view of the witness referred to in the opening verses of the Epistle.

I come now to the second passage cited by Dr. Sanday. In John I. 14 we read: "And the Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us (and we beheld—ἐθεασάμεθα—His glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father), full of grace and truth." On this passage Dr. Sanday writes with scholarly restraint: "If this had stood alone, it might have seemed an open question whether 'we beheld' was not used in a vague sense of Christians generally—or even of the human race, as 'tabernacled among us' just before might mean 'among men.' But the more specific reference would be more pointed; and it is favoured by the analogy of the passage of which we have just been speaking (that is, 1 John I. 1-4) as well as of those which follow."[15] Professor Bacon, however, will not allow that there can be any reference here to the fact that one or more apostles beheld Christ's glory, and he proceeds to argue against the possibility of such a view. "Does the author," he writes, "refer in 'tabernacled among us,' to us twelve Apostles, or does he mean us, the spiritual Israel who 'received him.'" When he says: "We beheld His glory full of grace and truth, *for we all received* from His fullness of grace, does he mean to exclude from this experience all but the first generation? If so, the ubiquitous signs of his relationship to Paul are very fallacious. What incredible belittling must the Gospel itself undergo when it is a question of rescuing the tradition of Johannine authorship?"[16] From which it is clear that the Professor understands the words "We beheld His glory" of the spiritual Israel; that is, not of the apostles merely, nor of the Ephesian teachers only, nor even of the first generation of Christians, but of Christians generally, and he seeks to support this view by so manipulating the text as to make it seem to convey that as many as received Christ's grace beheld His glory.

[14] "Ἐχειν hanc μαρτυριαν, est *tenere testimonium*, in eo exhibendo constanter perseverare." Grimm, sub voce μαρτ.

[15] *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 77.

[16] *Ibid.* p. 130.

The first comment I wish to make on this specimen of the Professor's exegesis is that he tampers with the text, and very seriously. The text in no manner implies that the vision of Christ's glory in question is a result of the reception of His grace. It states that "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt amongst us, full (πλήρης, agreeing with λόγος) of grace and truth; and it is an unquestionably parenthetic clause that makes the statement: "We beheld His glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father." Then after another parenthesis, contained in verse 15, we read in verse 16: "For of His fullness we all received, and grace for grace." The connection, therefore, is that the Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us, full of grace and truth, for of His fullness we all received; and the sense of the parenthetic clause: "We beheld His glory" still remains to be determined independently. But see how the Professor gives the passage, in inverted commas too, in a form that at once extends the vision of Christ's glory to all Christians, by suggesting that as many as received His grace beheld His glory: "We beheld His glory full of grace and truth, *for we all received*[17] from his fullness of grace." One is tempted to remark: What incredible tampering with its text must even the Gospel submit to, when it is a question of overthrowing the traditional view as to its authorship!

There is absolutely nothing in the text or context to forbid the view accepted throughout Christendom for eighteen centuries that in the words: "We beheld His glory" St. John is referring to his own past experiences or to those of himself and the other Apostles. Even if Christ is said to have dwelt among men generally, and not merely among the Apostles, obviously there may still be special reference to particular witnesses of His glory; and the fact that in verse 14 "We all" is used to denote Christians in general, is an indication that the simple "we" of the parenthetic clause in verse 14 has a more restricted reference. And since, as we have seen, the author of the first Epistle of St. John must be understood as referring to the experiences of an apostle, we may well believe

[17] The italics are the Professor's.

that a similar appeal is made here. Indeed, if, as is not denied, *ἐθεασάμεθα* ('we beheld') excludes mere spiritual or mystical vision, it is exceedingly improbable that a writer of the second century, who had never seen Christ, would use the words: "We beheld His glory." He had no more right or reason to do so than an author of to-day, and it will hardly be denied that they would come strangely from any writer at present. If, in addition to all this, it be borne in mind that St. John, to whom tradition has ever ascribed the Gospel, was one of the three apostles who witnessed Christ's transfiguration, and, in the words of St. Luke, saw His glory (*εἶδον τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ*),[18] we may safely conclude that the aorist *ἐθεασάμεθα* points back to occasions like the transfiguration and the marriage feast of Cana, where Jesus afforded a glimpse of His glory[19] and our Evangelist was an eye-witness.

The third and last text cited by Dr. Sanday as pointing directly to apostolic authorship, is J. XIX, 35: "And he that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true; and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye also may believe." I do not quite agree with Dr. Sanday's view of the text, but I am not concerned with that now. Professor Bacon holds this verse to be from the hand of his Redactor, and understands it as follows: Redactor here states that he who witnessed the piercing of Christ's side and the subsequent issue of blood and water—in Redactor's view St. John, as the Professor admits—has borne witness, and his witness is true, and he knoweth that he saith true, for we have evidence of his assurance on the point in another of his writings, namely 1 John v, 6-13. A pretty interpretation surely, and one that shows excellently to what extremes some people can resort to bolster up a theory! In the first place, the reference of the verse to a Redactor is utterly unwarranted—there is not a particle of evidence to support it except the *ipse dixit* of certain critics; and in the next place, even if we admitted that the verse is due to a Redactor, the appeal to 1 John v, 6-13 as the ground of his statement is

[18] L. IX, 32.

[19] Cf. J. II, 11, *καὶ ἐφανέρωσεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ.*

equally unwarranted and arbitrary, and, moreover, is positively excluded by the word "knoweth." If the Professor's view were correct, if a Redactor, writing towards the middle of the second century, when St. John was long dead, had written this verse, and fancied he found in 1 John v, 6-13 evidence that the Evangelist was assured of the truth of the witness referred to in John xix, 35, he might have written: He that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true, and he affords evidence elsewhere that it is true; but he could never have written: "He *knoweth* that he saith true." The word "knoweth" proves that the witness in question was still alive when the verse was penned, and hence positively excludes the view that it could have been written by a Redactor who was "a contemporary of Papias, Polycarp and Justin." We may say of a dead man that he still speaks or witnesses, meaning that he does so in his writings, but we do not say of him that he still "knoweth."

The Evangelist, therefore, appeals to a living witness, and everything points to the conclusion that this witness is no other than himself. Writing many years after the tragic event of which he was an eye-witness, he objectifies himself, so to speak, and refers in the third person to himself as having beheld on Calvary what he now records in the Gospel. That he could use the word ἐκεῖνος to refer to himself, there is no doubt;[20] and the fact that he not only represents the witness as witnessing still ('saith'), but testifies to the witness's present consciousness ('knoweth'), clearly indicates that he is the witness himself. What could the writer, whether Evangelist or Redactor, know of the present consciousness of another? Lastly, the closing words of the passage: "That ye also may believe," show that the Evangelist is himself the witness. Who but the writer of the verse can be supposed to bear present testimony ('saith') in order that the readers of the Gospel ('ye') may believe? Thus, while the verse cannot possibly be from the pen of a late Redactor, it seems certain that the writer himself

[20]Cf. Xenophon's *Anabasis*, iv, iv, 12; Aristoph. *Nubes*, 1497 sq. John ix, 36, 37.

here claims to have been an eye-witness of the crucifixion. If then, as there is no reason to doubt,[21] the Fourth Gospel was written at Ephesus about the end of the first century, when the witnesses of the crucifixion surviving at Ephesus must have been few indeed; if, moreover, the aged apostle John lived on there till that time, there is surely strong ground for accepting the unanimous testimony of tradition that the Gospel is really his work.

As it has not been my purpose in this article to prove the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel, nor even to refer to the manifold evidence, external and internal, that goes to establish it, but simply to show the shallow and flimsy character of the arguments used by Professor Bacon to assail it, I may now conclude. I have said enough, I hope, to prove that the direct claim of the Johannine writings to apostolic authorship cannot be so easily disposed of as Professor Bacon and others appear to imagine. If that claim is to be rejected, the evidence to justify its rejection is still awaited and is certainly not to be found in the article I have been criticising nor, I make bold to say, anywhere else.

J. MacRory.

Maynooth College,
Dublin, Ireland.

[21] See *Irish Theological Quarterly*, Jan., 1908.

NOTES ON EDUCATION.

An Educational Standard.

When, three years ago, Mr. Carnegie transferred $10,000,000 in five per cent. bonds of the United States Steel Corporation to a Board of Trustees to provide retiring pensions for college professors in the United States, Canada, and Newfoundland, many were disposed to regard the action as springing from motives of charity towards the poor and worthy professors who, after a life of toil in behalf of the rising generation, too frequently spent their declining years in poverty. The three years of the administration of this fund, however, have demonstrated the fact that it has other and probably more important functions than this to perform.

The fund is to apply to universities, colleges, and technological schools without regard to race, sex, creed, or color. This seems to be very broad and one expects to find it embracing something over 700 educational institutions, but the scope of the foundation is limited to a small section of these educational institutions because it excludes all state or colonial institutions and all institutions that are under the control of a sect or that require trustees, officers, faculty or students to belong to any specified sect, or which impose any theological test. The trustees of this fund have proceeded on two assumptions: first, that the chief value of the retiring allowance to the teacher consists in removing the disquieting uncertainty which goes with a small income, thus leaving him free to devote himself heartily to the work of teaching; second, that to better the profession of teaching and to attract into it increasing numbers of strong men it is necessary that the retiring allowance should come as a matter of right and not as a charity.

This latter consideration made it seem advisable to the trustees to deal with the retiring professors through the institutions in which they teach. Hence it became necessary at the very

outset to determine what colleges and universities in the United States, Canada and Newfoundland came within the scope of the foundation. Such a determination in the case of any single educational institution involves two things: first, the relation of the institution to the State and to religious denominations, and secondly, the rank of the institution as an educational agency. These are two very difficult problems and the operation of the Carnegie Foundation has already thrown considerable light on both of them. Only fifty institutions in the United States and one university in Halifax and one in Montreal were found to meet the requirements out of the seven hundred institutions that occupy the field of higher education within the limits of the prescribed territory. The Report of 1907 shows the addition of three colleges to this list. The institutions for higher education in this country and Canada exhibit a great variety of relationships to the State and to religious denominations, and it is no easy matter to determine in any way that is not arbitrary just where to draw the line when there is a question of bringing the institution within the scope of the Carnegie Foundation. In order to administer the fund intelligently the trustees find it necessary to examine the interrelations of all manner of educational institutions with Church and State. Their findings will be followed with keen interest by every one who is interested in the problems of education in this country.

The second problem is still more difficult than the first and the value of the solution is higher. This involves the determination of what constitutes a college or a university. The operation of the Carnegie Fund will help to throw light on this question in the public mind. Outside of a few localities, such as New York, the terms college and university are used with great freedom. Sometimes they are used to designate educational institutions that do not rank with a good high school, and the name university is frequently borne by educational institutions in which no university work is or ever has been carried out. Many so-called universities are at best nothing more than colleges.

The trustees of the Carnegie Fund have started out with an

arbitrary definition of what constitutes a college, although it is stated that this definition is a very close copy of that adopted in the revised ordinances of the State of New York. The trustees are, of course, within their rights when they adopt for their own use a definition of a college, however arbitrary it may seem to others. Here is the definition adopted by the rules of the Carnegie Foundation: "An institution to be ranked as a college must have at least six professors giving their entire time to college or university work, a course of four full years in liberal arts and sciences, and should require for admission not less than the usual four years of academic or high school preparation, or its equivalent, in addition to the preacademic or grammar school studies."

In order to determine what constitutes "four years of academic or high school preparation" the trustees have adopted the plan which has recently come into somewhat general use by college entrance examination boards. In this plan college entrance requirements are stated in terms of "units," a unit being a course of five periods weekly throughout an academic year of the preparatory school. Now, in order to determine the value of the work done, the trustees have accepted as a unit the amount of work which is generally performed in a good college within the time limits mentioned above as constituting a unit.

To any one at all familiar with the conditions prevailing in our schools it will be seen to be a matter of very great difficulty to determine the standing of the various educational institutions in the United States along the lines indicated above. The effort, however, to fix such a common standard will go no inconsiderable distance towards standardizing the work in these institutions.

The second annual report of the President and Treasurer of the Carnegie Foundation is chiefly occupied with the examination of the interrelations of educational institutions and with the facts of educational organization as these bear on the policy of the Foundation. It is insisted upon that the Foundation is not a charity, but an educational agency whose centralizing influence is turned towards the securing of educa-

tional coherence and educational unity. In other words, the Carnegie Foundation fixes its own educational standards and then grants its retiring pensions to the professors of such institutions as comply with these standards. This procedure, as might be expected, enlists the earnest coöperation of the faculties of all institutions that are otherwise eligible in the endeavor to attain the standard set for them by the Carnegie Foundation. This Fund, judiciously administered, promises to accomplish much in the coördinating of our high schools, colleges and universities. We quite agree with President Pritchett that there is an urgent need at the present time of securing a clear conception of the function of the high school, the college and the university. "Once there can be secured general agreement as to where the high school leaves off and the college begins, and as to the distinction between a college and a university, it will be possible to effect far-reaching improvements in preparatory, college, and university education." We also find ourselves in agreement with President Pritchett when he says, "Unless the college is to articulate with the high school, the system of education in any community cannot be a consistent one. . . . The ablest professor is unable to impart instruction of college grade to a class of high school youths, and as the upper classes develop out of the freshmen year, the standard of the freshmen year fixes the standard of the college."

As has been said, the Carnegie Foundation is within its proper rights when it undertakes to determine the conditions upon which it will grant retiring allowances to professors or to any other class of citizens, and if the carrying out of its policy results in the general good of the community, we shall all be duly grateful. Only fifty-five out of about seven hundred educational institutions have thus far come within the provisions of the Carnegie grant, and these institutions, from the nature of the case, are culled from a large number of private and non-denominational schools. That it should coördinate and standardize these and other private institutions is an unquestionable good and that the example set by this process will bring about similar coördination in State institutions or in

institutions subject to denominational control is quite likely and very much to be desired. But there is another aspect of the question which is brought to the surface by William H. Carpenter, of Columbia University, which is one of the beneficiaries of the Fund, in his review of the second annual report of the Carnegie Foundation. "The report considers in detail the whole subject of denominational connection and control in the higher institutions of learning. It concludes that denominational connection plays little if any part in the religious or intellectual life of the student body, and that denominational conditions are serious limitations and denominational control a hindrance and nearly always a source of organic weakness to the college organization. The grounds upon which such connection and control are defended—viz., a belief that such institutions are more likely to be conducted by strictly religious men; that financial assistance is readily obtained from the denomination concerned; and, most influential of all, that a constituency to which it appeals for students is thus provided—are rejected as conjectural only, and untenable in the light of experience."

In the light of such statements as this it would seem that the $10,000,000 set aside by Mr. Carnegie for "the advancement of teaching" is in danger of being used as a bribe to educational institutions to withdraw themselves from denominational control wherever possible. Religion is banished by law from State schools; and are the millions of the United States Steel Corporation to be used in driving religious control out of the schools that do not come under State control? Such de-Christianization may be no part of the founder's intention or of the intention of the trustees of the fund, but such seems to be the logic of the facts involved. Again, Mr. Carpenter's generalization, or is it the generalization of the President and Treasurer of the Carnegie Foundation, would seem to be too general. If he meant it to include the really large number of Catholic colleges and universities, his statement is certainly very far from true, and it is not permissable to speak of the colleges and universities of the United States and Canada and ignore the institutions under the control of the Catholic Church. According to the Catholic Directory there were in 1906, 198

Catholic colleges for boys, besides 86 ecclesiastical seminaries. Of these neither Mr. Carpenter nor the President of the Carnegie Foundation could say with truth that "denominational connection plays little if any part in the religious or intellectual life of the student body, and that denominational conditions are serious limitations and denominational control a hindrance and nearly always a source of organic weakness to the college organization."

The standardizing of 55 private colleges and universities by a purely private foundation is a very interesting illustration of what may be accomplished in the educational field of this country. The Carnegie Foundation reaches down to the high school and helps to determine the content and organization of the curriculum although it does not extend its benefactions to them; it is setting up a standard of college work that bids fair to be generally recognized and followed; it is drawing the lines of demarcation clearly between the high school and the college and between the college and the university. All of this, as has been said, is a work of great value and it is to be hoped that some means will be found to bring about similar results in the field of Catholic education. We need uniform standards and we are in still greater need of a closer coördination among our educational institutions. It is not to be believed that the Church's genius for organization will fail to express itself in her educational work.

Higher Education in the United States.

The United States Bureau of Education has recently published some very interesting statistics on the work of universities, colleges and technological schools in this country. The Commissioner's Report covers the work of 622 of these institutions for the year 1906. The extent of coeducation is shown by the fact that 335 of these institutions are open to both men and women; 158 are reserved for men, and 129 are for women only. The total number of instructors in these institutions was 23,950. Of these 4,735 were women. The 129 colleges for women had 2,859 instructors, of whom 695 were men. The co-

educational institutions and men's colleges employed 18,520 men teachers and 2,571 women teachers. Of these latter numbers 11,012 men and 1,256 women taught undergraduate students exclusively.

157,933 students attended these 622 institutions. Of these 97,738 were men, 60,195 were women. The degrees conferred during the year give a fairly good indication of the directions in which the education of the men and the women is tending. During the school year 20,655 academic degrees were conferred, not including honorary degrees. 14,033 of these degrees were received by men and 6,620 by women. The characteristic lines of study adopted by the two sexes are indicated by the degrees which they received. Although it is but a comparatively short time since women entered the field for academic degrees 4,183 women received the A. B. degree during the year ending June, 1906, as against 5,835 men, and 510 women received the B. L. as against 132 men. In music women have the field almost wholly to themselves, 255 women having received the B. Mus. as against 8 men. In painting the proportion is nearly the same, 24 women having received the B. Paint. as against 1 man. The fields that women have not yet entered are indicated by the following degrees which were conferred on the number of men indicated but which no woman had received. B. C. E. 47, B. M. E. 51, B. E. E. 3, B. E. M. 5, Met. E. 3, A. C. 5, B. Agri. 23, A. A. 2, Ph. M. 29, C. E. 362, M. E. 494, E. E. 157, E. M. 193, M. M. E. 4, M. Acc. 113, M. F. 15, M. Agri. 1, Sc. D. 1, M. C. S. 2, M. C. E. 3, Ph. L. 4, Mus. D. 1, M. Dip. 2.

That women are beginning to enter the higher fields of science and philosophy as well as those of arts and letters is indicated by the fact that the B. S. was conferred on 700 women and 3,921 men. The Ph. B. was conferred on 430 women as against 764 men. The B. E. was conferred on 16 women and 89 men. The M. S. was conferred on 15 women and 168 men. The Ph. D. was conferred on 25 women and 312 men. The degrees conferred in Pedagogy are somewhat surprising. The women predominating in the higher department and the men predominating in the lower. Thus the B. Ped. was conferred

on 24 men and 14 women, while the M. Ped. was conferred on only 4 men and on 14 women.

The Ph. D. degree is usually reserved for those who have been adequately trained and who have performed successful work in the graduate field. By general consent the Ph. D. is not conferred as an honorary degree, nevertheless, during the school year referred to, the following seven institutions conferred 18 honorary Ph. D. degrees: Hanover College (Ind.) 1, St. Anselm's College (N. H.) 4, St. John's College (N. Y.) 1, Oregon Agricultural College, 1, Grove City College (Penn.) 7, Villanova (Penn.) 3, Allen University (S. C.) 1. These 18 degrees were not included in the numbers mentioned above. The institutions conferring the Ph. D. on women in regular course were as follows: Yale 2, University of Chicago 4, Radcliffe 2, University of Michigan 1, University of Nebraska 2, Cornell 3, Columbia 4, Bryn Mawr 2, University of Pennsylvania 5. The Ph. D. was conferred on men in regular course by the following institutions: Harvard 46, Columbia 38, Johns Hopkins 32, Yale and the University of Chicago 27 each, Pennsylvania 23, Cornell 16, Clarke 13, Wisconsin 9, Boston 10, New York and Michigan 8 each, Catholic University, Nebraska University, Princeton University, Ewing College, University of Iowa 5 each, California and Denver Universities 4 each, University of Illinois 3, Leland Stanford, Colorado, George Washington, Minnesota, and Washington Universities 2 each, Taylor University (Indiana), Tufts College, Dartmouth College, College of St. Francis Xavier, Western University of Pennsylvania, Franklin and Marshall College, Brown, Vanderbilt, and Washington and Lee Universities 1 each.

The friends of the Catholic University will notice with pride and pleasure that though a young institution it ranks very high among the educational institutions of the United States when judged by the number of students which it prepares for the higher degrees. The Commissioner's Report, from which we have quoted, does not take into account the work done under the Theological Faculties or the Faculty of Law, and in these departments the Catholic University does much of its advanced

work. Judged by its work in the Department of Philosophy alone, the Catholic University comes thirteenth in the long list of Universities conferring the Ph. D. degree. It is also pleasant to note that there were only eight institutions in the United States that received more generous financial support during the year in question.

Benefactions to Educational Institutions During the Year Ending June, 1906.

According to the Report of the Bureau of Education, $17,716,605 were donated or bequeathed to institutions for higher education in the United States during the year ending June, 1906. This was distributed among a large number of colleges and universities. 39 institutions received $100,000 or over. Harvard University received $2,218,118; Yale University, $1,145,575; Columbia University, $1,050,323; the University of Pennsylvania, $544,832; Princeton University, $523,511; Northwestern University, $523,422; the University of Chicago, $478,673; Western Reserve University, $473,000; the Catholic University, $338,069; Oberlin College, $322,416; the University of California, $292,627; Olivet College, $250,000; Occidental College (Los Angeles) $225,000; Cornell University, $216,000; Morningside College, $204,000; Williams College, $236,034; Grant University, (Tenn.) $206,766; Pennsylvania College for Women, $194,000; Swathmore College, (Penn.) $190,000; Bryn Mawr College, $190,000; the University of Minnesota, $185,000; Wittenburg College, (Ohio) $170,000; Norwich University, (Vermont) $154,000; Leander Clarke College, $150,000; Brown University, $143,015; Hope College, (Mich.) $130,000; Bowdoin College, $125,000; Syracuse University, $129,563; Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, (N. Y.) $114,500; Gilbert College, $115,000; Lehigh University, (Penn.) $122,148; Huron College, $110,799; Allegheny College, $103,000; Kingfisher College, (Okla.) $110,000; McKendree College, (Ill.) $109,000; and Howard College, (Ala.) De Pauw University, (Ind.) the University of Michigan, and Washington College, (Tenn.) $100,000 each.

The Passing of the Man Teacher.

Between the years 1900 and 1906 inclusive the number of men teachers in the United States decreased twenty-four per cent. This state of affairs is causing serious apprehension in the minds of thoughtful men among us, and the educators of other countries look upon it with some amazement. That the teaching profession repels our young men is evident. This is sometimes attributed to the limited salaries of our teachers and to the opportunities of building up a fortune which are offered in business and the professions. C. W. Bardeen, in the *Educational Review* for April takes direct issue with this view. "It is not a matter of wages. Professionally fitted men teachers get a higher average salary than the average incomes of lawyers, physicians, clergymen, and business men in their communities. There are even beginning to be prizes for superior teachers. Salaries of $5,000 are common, $10,000 is not infrequent, $20,000 has been offered several times; there have been private school principals who cleared $100,000 a year. These figures in connection with the fact that the teacher begins with a considerable salary instead of having to wait for years to establish himself, makes teaching financially attractive."

Mr. Bardeen assigns four reasons to account for the fact that our young men refuse to enter the teaching profession. "First, it is a hireling occupation. A college president was once comparing his work with mine. 'For one thing, you are your own master,' he said. 'Yes,' I replied, 'it is a good many years since I have had to take orders from any body.' 'That's just it,' he mused thoughtfully; and though he is one of the great college presidents, a man with whose work mine is not for a moment to be measured, I could see that in this respect he envied me.

He gives as the second reason that "teaching is looked down upon in the community." He assigns as the third reason that "teaching usually belittles a man. . . . His daily dealing is with petty things, of interest only to his children and a

few women assistants, and under regulations laid down by outside authority, so that large questions seldom come to him for consideration." The fourth reason is somewhat in the nature of an anticlimax. "Teaching tends to bad manners and bright young men who see this hesitate to be classed with teachers."

Character Formation in the High School.

The State control of education is growing rapidly in the United States. This is manifesting itself in many ways side by side with a strongly marked centralizing tendency. Edward O. Sisson, of the University of Washington, writing on "The High School's Cure of Souls," in the *Educational Review*, April, 1908, says several things that should furnish food for thought to all who believe that religion has an important part to play in the formation of character and in the intellectual development of our future citizens. "The separation of church and state, and the loss of catholicity in the external church have brought about the present conditions respecting religious and moral training: the church is no longer adequate for the task, and the state has not yet fully got its shoulders under the burden. This paper is written in the firm belief that the state, and especially its chief educational agent, the school, must and will assume complete responsibility for the development of moral character in all its youth; the trend in this direction is already well developed and unmistakable."

There are a great many thoughtful students of education who do not share "the firm belief" of Dr. Sisson that religion is passing and that it has ceased to be able to perform its chief function in this world—the formation of the moral character of youth. While Dr. Sisson declares that "the church is no longer adequate for the task," he is unable to point to any marked achievement in this direction by "the state" or "its chief educational agent, the school." He sets forth very clearly both the opportunity and the importance of developing the character of youth during the high school period. "The high school, of all grades of school education, should

take the most active and effective part in the formation of character. All this becomes far more striking when we remember that out of the high school come practically all our *leaders* of every kind, social, moral, religious, political, and intellectual; through a single high school boy the opportunity may be given to determine the conduct and the destiny of a dozen, a score, a thousand, of those who do not enjoy the privilege of any part of a liberal education, through the leadership which that boy may exercise in his natural life."

With this splendid opportunity and with this urgent need of moral formation, what have the State high schools that have banished religion from the curriculum and eliminated its atmosphere from the schools accomplished? Let their advocate speak. "What do we find to be the actual condition in our high schools in this respect? The teacher, here as elsewhere in our schools, is of unimpeachable character; it is foolish to doubt or deny the good moral influence of the school. With the cry of godlessness against the schools, now fortunately falling into discredit, no one who knows the schools has a moment's sympathy. The high school, like the elementary school, certainly exerts a beneficent influence upon the habits and character of its pupils. But this influence is almost entirely confined, as its admirers admit or even assert, to the operation of the personality of the teacher and the work and order of the school,—in other words, to the kind of influence in which the home, the calling, and the social life peculiarly excel. The peculiar duty of the school, which cannot be fulfilled by any other agency, is, as we have seen, other than this, namely the creation of ethical enlightenment and of rational will. And in this respect the high school falls utterly short of its ideal; upon the intellect the school does assuredly work (though not always with the best results even upon the intellectual side), but through the intellect upon the will the school works but very little."

The State school will have to furnish forth more cogent proofs of its fitness to form the moral character of youth before religious-minded men will be disposed to entrust them with the future welfare of their children and with the formation of

their intellectual and moral life. The old test still holds, "By their fruits ye shall know them." When the State high school produces results along ethical and moral lines comparable to those produced by religious schools, it will be time enough for the champions of State monopoly of education to put forth their claim to supersede religion.

We entirely agree with Dr. Sisson in the importance which attaches to these four formative years, but from this we would draw practical conclusions of quite an opposite character. Students of genetic psychology will not find it difficult to concur, at least in the broad outlines of Dr. Sisson's major premise. "Probably the child's moral possibilities may be blasted before he is fourteen years old; certainly, on the other hand, much may be done before that age in laying the foundation for a complete moral character in the form of physical and mental habits; but genuine moral character, autonomy of will, the power of intelligent self-direction, does not and cannot form before this age, but must in the main be developed later. A period varying somewhat with the individual, but in general not far from the age of high school attendance, is marked by the transition from the state of imitation and obedience to that of volitional intelligence and self-direction; there is reason to believe that the high school period is even more critical and determinative than that of the college; the fact that more religious conversions occur in the high school period than in any other cannot be without significance with respect to moral development."

If those who think with Dr. Sisson, that religion has ceased to be able to deal with this transitional phase of character, and that the state is equipped for the task, will carefully consider the Church's method of dealing with such matters, they may hesitate before drawing the conclusion that Dr. Sisson reaches. The following pages of these notes are intended as a brief outline of such a study. For those who wish to look deeper into the matter there is abundant literature in the Liturgy and Practice of the Catholic Church and in the recent developments of genetic psychology.

The Neural Basis of Feeling.

That feeling plays an important rôle in mental development and in the building up of habits is admitted by all students of genetic psychology. But feeling has not yet won the recognition which its importance deserves from those who are occupied in the writing of text-books and the framing of methods of elementary instruction. In a general way it is understood that intense feeling, whether of pleasure or of pain, tends to fix the mental states which accompany such feelings, but it is assumed by many that the ferule is quite as effective as the most winning smile in fixing the mental state.

Progress in cerebral physiology during the past few decades, together with the recent studies in genetic psychology, are making it increasingly evident that a knowledge of the functions of feeling in reënforcing or inhibiting neural currents lies at the basis of character building and, indeed, it plays a large part in the formation of habits of correct thinking. The conviction is growing upon many educators that, in spite of the technical difficulties that hedge around the subject, every teacher of a primary grammar grade no less than of a high school class should be more or less familiar with this chapter of genetic psychology.

The Polarity of Nerve Currents.

According to the doctrine of the polarity of nerve currents, announced by Ramon y Cajal in the early nineties and abundantly confirmed by other workers since that time, the direction of nerve currents is never reversed. Afferent nerve currents generated by peripheral stimuli flow into the central nervous system where they meet innumerable branching pathways, each one of which leads to some motor end-organ or gland. But what determines the nerve current in its choice of pathways through the central nervous system?

"The principle of contractility," says Baldwin (*Mental Development, Meth. and Proc.*, p. 166) "recognized in biology simply states that all stimulations to living matter,—if they

take effect at all, tend to bring about movements or contractions in the mass of the organism. This is now also safely established as a phenomenon of consciousness—that every sensation or incoming process tends to bring about action or outgoing process."

The earliest habits to appear in the organism have as their immediate neural basis partially formed inherited pathways. Whether these habits result in the suppression or in the final establishment of the underlying incipient pathways depends in large measure on the affective quality of the accompanying conscious states.

Now, when the incoming nerve currents overflow the previously existing pathways, they tend to form new pathways through the central nervous system to the motor end-organs, and thus the complexity of the responsive movements is increased. In the formation of these new pathways affective consciousness plays the same important rôle that it does in the modification of inherited pathways; it tends to inhibit all such new modes of response as result in painful feeling, and it reënforces such new modes of response as lead to pleasurable feeling.

Each time a nerve current passes over any given course in the central nervous system it leaves behind it an organic memory, or lessened resistance to the passage of all subsequent nerve currents. But this path of lessened resistance does not necessarily result in a sensory-motor habit. The final outcome depends upon the character of the accompanying affective state. Where the passage of such nerve currents leads to pain the resulting inhibition may be more than sufficient to counterbalance the lessened resistance caused by the passage of the current in the first instance.

This truth is forcibly stated by Professor Baldwin, (*op. cit.*, pp. 215-16). "We find it necessary to consider that the repetition of movement is not at all what the organism is after, nor indeed is it what the principle of habit rests upon. It is not true that all movements are 'equal before law'—the law of habit. Movements which cause pain do not tend to be repeated. They are exceptions to the law of habit, as that is usually formulated. Painful movements are inhibited, they

tend to be reversed, squelched, utterly blotted out; how can this be explained on the foregoing formula of habit? It cannot be explained. And yet it is found to be a fact in the lowest living creatures that the biologist knows."

The Physiological Basis of Habit.

The first effect of a "movement," or the passage of a sensory-motor current, is unquestionably to lessen the resistance to subsequent nerve currents and thus to facilitate the repetition of the movement. But this tendency may be more than counterbalanced by the painful conscious state accompanying the movement. Affective consciousness is thus seen to play the leading rôle in determining the formation of sensory-motor habits, or quasi-reflexes, as they are sometimes called. But affective consciousness exerts its influence chiefly in the repetition of the response and consequently it does not account for the direction taken by the nerve current in the first instance.

Angell accounts for the original path of the nerve current through the central nervous system on the principle of "diffusion." "Let us take as a typical instance of the development of motor control the series of events which occur when a baby first learns to connect a visual impression with a movement of his hand and arm. Suppose a bright, colored ball is held before his eyes. This stimulus sends strong sensory currents over the optic tracts to the brain centers and somehow or other, as we have seen, these currents must get out again in the form of movements. But we have also seen that there are few or no preformed reflex pathways over which such neural excitement may be discharged. Consequently, instead of some single relatively simple movement like that of reaching, what we observe is precisely what the principle of 'diffusion' postulates as normal, that is, a mass of aimless, uncoördinated movements in a larger number of muscles. The face is wrinkled in a frown or a smile, as the case may be, the fingers open and shut, the arms jerk about, the body and legs move spasmodically and possibly the child cries out. . . . Presently if the stimulus be made more exciting by moving it to and fro,

some of these excessive movements of the arms will result in the child's hand coming in contact with the ball. We have already noticed the hereditary clasping reflex, and we shall not be surprised, then, to find that the tactual stimulus to the skin of the hand results in the closing of the fingers. Now, undoubtedly, this first successful grasping of the seen object may be wholly accidental, in the sense that it is wholly unforeseen by the child. . . . In the first place, the mere shock of surprise and (generally) pleasure makes the connection of the tactual-motor sensation from his hand with the visual sensation from his eyes extremely vivid." (Angell, *Psychology,* pp. 53-4.)

That the law of diffusion takes part in the establishment of sensory-motor habits is more than probable, but it is quite another thing to assign to it, as Professor Angell here does, the chief rôle in the establishment of these quasi-reflexes. His first assumption "that there are few or no preformed reflex pathways over which such neural excitement may be discharged" seems scarcely warranted. In any case, the overwhelming majority of these quasi-reflexes arise as modifications of previously established reflexes, and the old pathways, even when they prove insufficient for the conduction of all the nerve currents involved, nevertheless exert a preponderating influence in the final reactions and consequently in the new modifications which, on their first appearance at least, are subordinated to the established reflexes.

Moreover, there is a third determining element in the situation the importance of which has come to be quite generally recognized. This element has been formulated in many ways, but in whatever way it is stated its essence is seen to consist in the tendency of the sensory image or other cognitive state to realize itself in action. It would seem from the data at our disposal that the image of any movement held in consciousness involves a "dynamogenetic" element, or an inherent tendency to flow out over determined efferent paths to the appropriate end-organ and thus to produce the imaged movement. This is, of course, in part a natural consequence of the polarity of nerve currents.

This tendency of the cognitive state to realize itself in action finds extreme exemplification in the phenomena of hypnotic suggestion. It also constitutes an essential element in the phenomena of imitation, which plays so important a rôle in mental development. However it may be accounted for, there is no questioning the fact that the vocal organs tend to produce the sound that reaches the ear, and rhythm in music tends to express itself in rhythmic movements of the hands and feet, etc.

Habits Derived from Feeling and Instinct.

The building up of sensory-motor adjustments to his physical environment is the chief occupation of the first few years of the child's conscious life. In this developmental phase inherited reflex activities form the basis or nucleus of growth through the continued modification of which there finally results the completed motor adjustments of the individual to his physical environment. In this developmental phase heredity, imitation, suggestion, and the law of diffusion play important rôles, but the controlling factor throughout the process seems to be the pleasure-pain quality of the conscious state evoked.

This phase of child life has been aptly termed the affective phase; it is dominated by affective consciousness which acts as a court of last appeal, determining which previous adjustments shall be suppressed and which shall be retained, and determining likewise which new adjustments shall be established and which established adjustments shall be so modified as to more adequately meet new situations. The unity and continuity which are essential features of all vital development are thus preserved throughout the whole series of changes that constitute the motor development of each individual.

This modifying of existing sensory-motor habits is known as "accommodation" and it is generally regarded as a factor of fundamental importance in mental development. "It is only in point here," says Baldwin (*op. cit.*, p. 168), "to show that this thing, accommodation, is a fact and that it consists in some influence in the organism which works directly in the face of habit."

Affective consciousness, therefore, plays the leading rôle in the gradual modification and elaboration of inherited reflex activities which constitute the sensory-motor adjustments of adult life and which free consciousness in so large a measure from the immediate control of such routine activities as those involved in walking, writing, the manipulation of musical instruments, etc. And affective consciousness plays a no less important part in the suppression or in the building up and elaboration of instincts into the virtues and the vices that characterize adult life, and that determine individual conduct in so large a measure.

Feeling and Mental Assimilation.

The rôle of affective consciousness in mental development, however, is not confined to the building up of sensory-motor adjustments and to the formation of habits of conduct. Every cognitive state, from the simplest sensation to the highest abstraction, is accompanied by feeling or characterized by an affective tone.

Sensation gradually emerges from a conscious matrix of feeling and as we pass from such primitive sensations as those of taste and smell, touch and temperature, to the sensations of hearing and sight the affective element gradually diminishes. But it is rarely or never wholly absent and it always retains its primitive significance, inhibiting sensations that are painful and reënforcing and securing the repetition of sensations that are pleasant.

In representation, in imagination, in memory, and in the processes of reasoning the affective element is likewise present. "We have spoken first of affection in dependence upon sensory activities, in part because it is in this connection that it first appears, and in part because the fundamental facts are here more obvious and less complex in their surroundings. But affection is of course a frequent companion of ideational processes, and it is, indeed, in this sphere that it gains its greatest value for the highest types of human beings. . . . We may conveniently take as the basis of our examination the processes

which we analyzed under the several headings of memory, imagination, and reasoning. Fortunately we shall find that the principles governing affection in these different cases are essentially identical. . . In a more detailed way we may say whatever furthers conscious activity at the moment in progress will be felt as agreeable, whatever impedes such activities will be felt as disagreeable." (Angell, *op. cit.*, pp. 263-4.)

We may safely lay it down as the first of the fundamental principles of education that *the presence in consciousness of appropriate feeling is indispensable to mental assimilation.*

Many sensory-motor reactions that are painful on their first occurrence finally become established as habits and seem to constitute exceptions to the foregoing principle, but they are in reality only seeming exceptions, for on repetition the reactions either cease to be disagreeable, as in the case of acquired tastes, or they fail to become established as habits. It is true that for ulterior purposes we may continue indefinitely to repeat actions that produce painful feeling but in these cases each action requires the direct intervention of the will and the repetition does not result in the formation of a habit in the sense in which we have been using the term.

Feeling and the Sacraments.

Where shall we find the school that in its methods presents a worthy embodiment of this principle? Fortunately for us we shall not have to travel far in our search. A pilgrimage to Europe will not be necessary. Universities and schools conducted on modern pedagogical principles surround us on every side, and yet it is not in any of these institutions of learning that we shall find the perfect embodiment of correct educational principles; this exists only in the *organic teaching of the Catholic Church* in which the Holy Spirit is the Teacher.

In the light of the body of scientific truth which we have been considering it would seem that the vitality of the Church's teachings, judged by human standards and apart from the supernatural influence of Divine Grace, depends in no small measure upon the way the Church, in her organic teaching, utilizes the

chief epochs of feeling in human life for implanting and nourishing into life the germs of the great spiritual truths of which she is the divinely appointed Guardian and Teacher.

This principle is embodied in every phase of her teaching, but for the purpose of illustrating the truth which we are here considering we need not look beyond her Sacramental System. Her seven sacraments are seven channels of divine grace through which her children receive assistance from on High for the building up of supernatural virtues and for the development in their souls of a Christian character. But she also utilizes her sacraments as educational agencies through which she implants in the souls of her children in each of the great epochs of human feeling the germs of the divine truths that will guide them safely through this world of darkness to the portals of eternal life.

When race instinct stirs to their depths the hearts of the father and the mother and fills them to overflowing with joy because a child is born to them, the Church brings the child to the baptismal font and in the presence of the rejoicing parents she claims the new life for the realms of light. Hand and foot, eye and ear and tongue and budding wisdom are all claimed for the service of God and for the higher life of the soul.

Joy is the dominant tone in the ritual of the baptismal ceremony. The evil one and his machinations are banished, the fetters of sin and of a material world are stricken from the child's soul, the Heavenly Father is called upon again and again to protect with loving kindness and to nourish with the food of Heavenly Wisdom the soul that is just beginning its earthly career.

Hope and joy and eternal life are promised in the name and through the merits of Jesus Christ, and while the babe is being regenerated by the saving waters of baptism, while Divine Grace is being infused into his soul, the Church through her baptismal ceremony with its symbolism and the lessons of its ritual implants in the hearts of the parents the great fundamental truths that must guide them in their efforts to bring

up their child to a life of virtue and in their efforts to teach him to walk in the ways of the Lord.

The first seven or eight years of the child's life are occupied mainly in the building up of suitable adjustments to his physical environment. When towards the end of this period the great, puzzling, outer world begins to reach his intelligence and to fill it with questioning wonder, when fundamental principles are for him still shrouded in obscurity and when they seem to him to blend into their opposites like the colors in a sunset sky, the Church leads him into the confessional and with loving kindness helps him to read his riddles.

She teaches him that no matter what his companions or acquaintances may say to the contrary, all conduct that conforms to the Will of God is right and leads to happiness and to Heaven, while all conduct that conflicts with the Divine Will leads to wretchedness and eternal misery. She teaches him that the secret of beauty dwells in all that harmonizes with the mantle of beauty in which God has clothed every work of his hands, and that whatever fails to harmonize with this essential beauty is ugly even though it should appeal to the tastes of the depraved. Finally, she teaches him that God is Truth and that whatever is in agreement with the truth which He has embodied in his Creation or which He has revealed through his Prophets, his Divine Son, and the living voice of his Church is true, and that whatever fails of such agreement is false, however plausible its seeming. With this three-fold standard engraved upon his young soul while it is glowing with joyous wonder over the revelation that is being unfolded to him on every side, he is sent out into life to conquer his world.

Race instincts manifest themselves at an early period in human life. From the tenth to the twelfth year the dawn of emotions and passions whose meaning is still obscure to the child begins to trouble the quiet of his soul. At this juncture the Church leads him to the Communion rail and in the midst of flowers, bridal wreaths, lights and music, accompanied by all the joy that breathes in her ritual, she teaches him the great lesson of love for Jesus and fellow man.

She teaches him that love is the key to the world of emotion and passion that is stirring the depths of his soul. She impresses upon him, in a way that he will never forget, that all love that harmonizes with the love of God and of fellow man, all love that is founded on truth and justice and that is permeated with generous self-sacrifice leads to joy and gladness, whereas all love that ignores the rights of others and the welfare of society and that is blinded by selfishness and out of harmony with the love of God and fellow man leads to wretchedness here and to eternal misery hereafter.

The Church calls upon the parents and the friends of the child to join with her in filling his soul on the happy occasion of his first Holy Communion with such joy and sweetness that in the stress of the storms of temptation and passion that are about to break over him he may be induced to return again and again to the Sacred Banquet and there renew in the love of Jesus Christ his strength for the combat.

When the instincts of chivalry are in their first glow and when they are beginning to manifest themselves in the boy's willingness to fight for his honor and for the honor and welfare of father and mother, of home and of country, the Church leads him to the altar and in the joy of Pentecost renewed teaches him that while it is manly to fight for one's honor and one's home and honorable to die for one's country, that there rests upon him a still higher obligation to fight for the honor of his Heavenly Father and to die if need be for the truths of the Heavenly Kingdom into which he was born by baptism and in which he is continually nourished by the love of Jesus Christ.

Few things possess value for the child or for the youth unless they are shared in by the members of the home group, but as maturity approaches the bonds of this solidarity are gradually dissolved and the young man and young woman are brought face to face with life and are called upon to perform their parts in the world and to make their contributions to the welfare of the race. If race instincts are strong in them and in their hearts the cry for home and wife or husband and children is louder and clearer than any other call,

the Church blesses them and in her Nuptial Mass, while pouring out to them her sympathy and her joy, she engraves upon their minds, filled with enthusiasm and lofty ideals, and upon their hearts, overflowing with love, the lessons that will help them to make their many sacrifices in order that there shall be two in one flesh and that they may bring into the world children and educate them for the Kingdom of Heaven.

If, on the other hand, as maturity approaches, the call to a higher life is felt, and if the tide of youthful ardor turns towards wider fields of action and towards closer union with the Saviour and Redeemer of the world, the Church leads these chosen souls into her sanctuary and shows them how their lives may be rendered enduringly helpful by being interwoven with the lives of their fellows in religious organizations that work unceasingly for the uplifting of the race to higher spiritual levels.

To such of her sons as feel themselves called to share more intimately in the priesthood of Jesus Christ and to be the bearers of succor to those who labor and are heavily burdened, the Church offers the sacrament of Holy Orders. And in each and every case, whether in the ceremony of the religious profession or in the conferring of Holy Orders, the ritual of the Church breathes solemn joy. The Church on these occasions appeals to all that is best in the candidate and in his soul, glowing with zeal and enthusiasm, she implants the great fundamental truths that must guide him and support him throughout all the coming years of labor and of patient endurance.

And at the very last, when death calls a child of the Church to his reward, she is by his side to close his senses to the sights and sounds of this world and to open to him the portals of that larger life to which there shall be no end. And in his heart, stirred with deep emotions in the presence of the coming change, and in the hearts of relatives and friends, softened by grief and sympathy, she implants the great fundamental truth that we are in this world but as wayfarers and as children far from home.

THOMAS EDWARD SHIELDS.

BOOK REVIEWS.

The Blind Sisters of St. Paul, by Maurice de la Sizeranne. Translated by L. M. Leggatt. New York, Benziger Brothers, 1907. Pp. 303.

Madame Louise de France, by Leon da la Brière. Translated by M. Brown. New York, Benziger Brothers, 1907. Pp. 209.

These two works constitute volumes V and VI respectively of the International Catholic Library. A more than usual interest attaches to the first, inasmuch as the author is totally blind, having lost the use of his sight in his eleventh year. Yet this serious drawback has not hindered him from developing his rich fund of natural talents under the benign influence of Catholic faith, and making his life of darkness one of great benefit to others. He is the director of two excellent periodicals for the blind, one known as the "Valentin Haüy," the other the "Louis Braille." Besides the book under review, two others have come from his gifted pen, "Impressions et Souvenirs d'un Aveugle," and "Les Aveugles par un Aveugle." The latter merited the distinction of being crowned by the French Academy. In his work on the Blind Sisters of St. Paul, he tells the interesting story of the humble origin and development of this unique religious community, whose aim is to render the blind useful members of society, and thus relieve them of the sadness coming from the sense of utter dependence on others. Their house in Paris is a refuge and school where blind girls and women, according to their varied tastes and capacity, are taught housekeeping, reading, writing, music, sewing, knitting, brushmaking, and printing of books for the blind. The manifold labors of this establishment, which numbers about sixty sisters, are divided among those who are blind as well as those who can see, the blind sisters forming one-third of the community. The detailed description of their varied occupations from day to day is told in a way to absorb the attention of the reader, and leads to an interesting and common-sense apology in behalf of religious vocations of women, especially of the blind. All this is preceded by an admirable study of the psychology of blind women, which fascinates both by its wealth of novel information and by its literary charm. Much praise

is due to the translator, who has given the original an attractive, idiomatic English dress.

In contrast with this brilliant volume, the life of Madame Louise de France makes a rather indifferent showing. Beyond the fact that she was the youngest daughter of King Louis XV, and that she gave a silent rebuke to the profligacy of his court by entering the Carmelite order at the age of thirty-three, there is little in her uneventful life that is apt to interest the reader. To fill out the meager data for the biography, the author has devoted a chapter,—the longest in the book,—to an arid description of the notable visitors who came to see Madame Louise in her Carmelite garb. Her letters, while breathing a spirit of piety appropriate to her religious calling, are not striking for depth or originality of thought. In short, the volume never rises above the level of mediocrity. One can not help thinking that it would never have been written had not its heroine been the daughter of a king. It seems a pity that it should have been chosen for presentation to English readers in preference to the edifying biographies of first rate excellence in which modern French literature abounds. It is a mystery how a work of so little merit came to be honored with a place in the International Catholic Library.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

Society, Sin and the Saviour, by Bernard Vaughan, S. J. St. Louis, B. Herder, 1907. Pp. 280.

In this book Father Vaughan gives to a wide circle of readers a series of discourses on the passion of our Lord, which he delivered before crowded audiences in the church of the Immaculate Conception, London. In the ten powerful sermons which make up the series, he speaks with soul on fire, rising at times to heights of true eloquence and lashing with unsparing vehemence the vices and silly fads of the so-called 'smart set.' He possesses many qualities of a great preacher, a rich vocabulary, vividness of description, imagination, pathos, burning zeal for what is right and holy, deep sympathy for the poor and afflicted. But it may be questioned whether he pursues the wisest course in rebuking pleasure-seekers with such stinging denunciation, and in directing these fierce rebukes against one particular class of society alone. It is hard at times to avoid the impression that he paints his pictures in too lurid colors, and this impression is not

weakened when we find him depicting certain Gospel characters with a freedom of fancy that is more becoming in a dramatist than in a preacher. Thus we are told that the besetting sin of Annas the high priest was avarice, and that he hated our Lord for turning the money changers out of the temple and thus lessening his worldly gains. We are asked to gaze on his vulture-like countenance, "his eager features with beak-like nose, his small, wild, black eyes deeply set beneath the high white brow, his long bony neck stretching forth out of a dark mantle of winter fur, his thin sinewy hands clutching, almost gnawing, the bench at which he sits."

But these flaws do not obscure the many excellent features of this series of sermons. They abound in fine passages that cannot fail to arouse the Christian soul to higher things.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

A Spiritual Retreat, by Reginald Buckler, O. P. New York, Benziger Brothers, 1907. Pp. 256.

For the priest busy with parish duties, suitable books for spiritual reading are not easy to find. Even when the subject matter is useful and interesting, the chapters are generally so long that the priest does not have leisure to read one at a sitting. How often when only half way through a chapter, he is called away, and has to interrupt his reading at a point where the theme is but partially developed. The next day when he takes up the broken thread of thought, he finds difficulty in fitting it to what had gone before.

In the present volume this difficulty is obviated. It offers an excellent series of short sermons or meditations on fundamental topics of religious life, averaging in length about seven pages. In them the reader will find a serious, common-sense piety and freshness of thought, expressed in terse, direct language. Many of them might serve as models of five minute sermons for the faithful. The author knows how to speak wisely and delightfully even on topics that are homely and common. Some of his best sermons are those on *The Use of Time, The Formation of Habits, Ordinary Actions.* It is a book that is sure to find a welcome place on the shelves of the priest's library.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

Contemplative Prayer, Ven. Father Augustine Baker's Teaching Thereon: From 'Sancta Sophia,' by Dom B. Weld-Blundell, O. S. B. New York, Benziger Brothers, 1907. Pp. 477.

The Degrees of the Spiritual Life, a Method of Directing Souls According to their Progress in Virtue, by Abbé A. Saudreau. Translated by Dom Bede Camm, O. S. B. 2 vols. New York, Benziger Brothers, 1907. Pp. 331 and 336.

The average reader will hardly feel inclined, much less competent, to ascend with these mystical writers to the summit of contemplative perfection, where the presence of God is realized by direct intuition, where the spiritual marriage of the soul to Christ is attained, and where its alternating concomitants of divine communications, visions, ecstacies, excruciating desolations and diabolic assaults are felt to be the order of the day. In both works, however, are directions and suggestions for conquering besetting temptations, overcoming scruples, and making progress in virtue that can be turned to account by that more numerous class of pious Catholics, who in their loving service of God do not scruple to enjoy the innocent, providential pleasures of life. Whether rightly or wrongly, there are few who would aspire to that perfection which, Father Baker tell us, characterized holy brother Roger, of the order of St. Francis, who "by elevating the powers of his soul and suspending them in God, lost during meals the perception of the sense of taste" (p. 160). Nor would many be content with "that debility which ordinarily attends a spiritual life; as St. Hildegarde observes, the love of God does not usually dwell in robust bodies" (p. 158). The style of Father Baker's book will perhaps be found somewhat heavy, but it has a distinct medieval flavor, as the following definition of prayer will show: "Prayer is an affective actuation of an intellective soul towards God, expressing or implying an entire dependence on Him as the Author of good."

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

Konversations Lexikon. B. Herder, (Freiburg, 1907. Third edition. 8 vols. 100 Marks.

The appearance in quick succession of volumes VII and VIII of *Herder's Konversations Lexikon* with which it is completed directs attention again to the great undertaking of this active and enterprising house in the interests of Catholic culture. From time to time, as the single volumes were published, notice of them has appeared in these pages. Volume VII "Pompejus"-"Spinner" and volume VIII "Spinnerei"-"Zt" are up to the high standard established by their predecessors. The maps, tables, text and supplements are all that the best in their line affords. Particularly interesting and instructive are the colored plates accompanying the articles on Uniforms, Costume, Textile Art and the maps showing the geographical distribution of animals throughout the earth, in volume VIII.

The fact that this work of the Herders has gone through three editions is proof enough of its merit. That the publishers have successfully completed a third edition is proof enough of their enterprise. It is useless to try any more to dispense with the use of encyclopedias. On the need of them, nothing new can be said or need be attempted. They are indispensable because of the demands of culture and scholarship on the cultured and scholarly. The tremendous growth of all sciences, the need of correlating their results and the mass of positive information achieved by modern scholarship are such that the individual is helpless before them. The encyclopedia is an age's institution by which the impossible is made possible, so to speak. There all results of sciences and arts are recorded, history is epitomized, the whole range of inquiry forced on one by the modern world is anticipated and in the space of a few volumes' wide range, thorough presentation of outline and often of detail, brevity and reliability are found. Ruskin once wrote, "I am not now able to keep abreast with the tide of modern scholarship nor, to say the truth, do I make the effort." But such admissions are rare and to some degree unnecessary. In the eight beautiful volumes of *Herder's Lexikon* there are 14,454 columns or 7227 pages of material, with 6540 illustrations, many beautifully colored and 189 tables accompanying texts or supplements.

One feels that with a lexicon such as this one is armed with all of the learning of the centuries, to borrow the phrase of the brilliant Lasalle. One must voice the regret that American Catholics with the exception of those who know German, cannot take advantage of this great work. Those interested in Catholic culture cannot fail to be

sensible of a great debt to Herders for this new monument to their zeal for the interests of Catholicity.

Wm. J. Kerby.

The Life of Christ, by Mgr. E. Le Camus. Translated by W. A. Hickey. New York, The Cathedral Library Association. Vols. II and III. 1907, 1908. Price, $1.75 each.

The first volume of Le Camus' Life of Christ has already been reviewed in the Bulletin, xiii, 143 f. The last two volumes now offered to the American public are in no way inferior to the first. We find the same scholarship, the same dignity in the presentation, the same respect for men and opinions, and finally the same accuracy and elegance of translation. One feature particularly seems worthy of notice, viz., the minute study and analysis of the words and discourses of the Master, in order to find their true literal and theological import. A lover of truth for its own sake, Bishop Le Camus has constantly endeavored to be candid and to avoid all quibbling and forced exegesis. As an example, let the reader examine what he has to say on the famous passage of Mt. xix, 8, relative to divorce (ii, 494, and note 12). True, the textual emendation which he proposes, "even though it be for fornication" does not seem to be a happy one : the context, especially when contrasted with Mk. xi, 11, 12, the parallel of Mt. v, 32 (cp. Le Camus himself, ii, 19) and finally the textual authorities, are against his correction ; few, besides, will believe that the exegesis of the *textus receptus* is as hopeless as it is represented to be ; but, we do admire the Bishop's frankness in telling us what he believes to be true, just as he sees it.

It is interesting also to see how the learned author has solved the much vexed problem of Gospel-eschatology (cp. especially iii, 115–153). With many others, he distinguishes various stages or aspects in the Parousia, the judgment and the establishment of the kingdom of God. One aspect of the foundation of the kingdom consists in the regeneration of the human soul which began with the preaching of Jesus (ii, 44); in this sense the kingdom is occasionally said to be present, Mt. xii, 28. This work was to be continued in and through the Church, and was to be more fully realized after the fall of Jerusalem : "In the same hour in which faithless Jerusalem shall cease to be, a Jerusalem of believers shall begin" (iii, 130). This is the meaning to be attached to the texts which speak of the return of

Christ during the present generation. Le Camus thinks, against many, that this and similar expressions do not admit of a protracted interval between the fall of the Holy City and the "Coming."

Another phase in the establishment of the Messianic Kingdom lies in its coming at the end of each individual life (III, 135). The expressions, "take heed," "watch," "be ye always ready," when combined with the sudden appearance of the Son of Man are referred to this second phase (III, 137 ff.).

In a final stage, Christ will confirm the individual judgments pronounced in the course of ages; then, the kingdom shall be consummated, and God shall reign forever. By combining these various data, we have a harmonious and well-balanced system. The fact that the author has not discussed other views concerning this important point of New Testament teaching, should not be construed as an indication of his having overlooked them: a 'Life of Christ' is not an introduction to the Gospels nor even a commentary on their various parts; it supposes both. Of course, Le Camus' arrangement is open to serious exegetical and historical difficulties, but what solution of the problem is not? It does seem, however, that more attention might have been paid to the Jewish eschatological literature, v. g. Henoch, Sybilline Oracles, Psalms of Solomon, Assumption of Moses, Apocalypse of Baruch, Fourth Esdras, etc.

The reader will not forget that Le Camus' work on the Apostles merited for him a very laudatory letter from the Holy Father. As the method followed in the present work is the same as the one commended by ecclesiastical authorities, we feel doubly secure in recommending this life of Christ to our readers; written by a learned Catholic bishop, it should be welcome both to the Christian whose piety it will promote and edify and to the scholar whose studies it will stimulate and direct.

R. BUTIN, S. M.

Leçons d'Écriture Sainte. Jésus-Christ, sa vie, son temps. Par Hippolyte Leroy, S. J. Année 1907. Paris, Beauchesne, 1907. Pp. 360. Price, Fr. 3.00.

The present volume is the thirteenth of the collection of Scriptural sermons which Father Leroy has preached in the Gesù of Paris and Brussels. As in the preceding volumes, the author intends to write the life of Christ from an historical point of view, and to give a literal

interpretation of His discourses. To this effect, he has utilized all recent works and discoveries calculated to throw additional light on his subject. The volume deals with the following topics: The Nuptial Feast; God and Cæsar; The Resurrection of the dead; Son of David and Son of Man; Authority in Doctrinal Matters; The Priest and error; The Widow's mite; The Law of History; The last days of Israel; The last days of the world. The conferences are written in an easy style, abound with keen observations and practical lessons. They will be of great service both to the clergy and to the cultured laity.

R. Butin, S. M.

"Maryland, My Maryland," and other Poems. By James Ryder Randall. John Murphy Co., (Baltimore, 1908). Pp. 180.

"Maryland, My Maryland" unquestionably ranks high among the world's great martial lyrics. Oliver Wendell Holmes considered it the greatest war song of any nation. A rare compliment coming as it does from a man of the North in whose defiance the poem was written, and from a citizen of that very State of Massachusetts, the assault upon whose troop in Baltimore, April, 1861, gave the occasion for its writing. The fact of this song now being the common patriotic refrain of some eighty million people, friends and foes alike, is perhaps the best proof of the accuracy of that criticism.

As pure poetry, however, it must take a lower rank. In fact, all war-songs must lose a certain poetic value by reason of the ruggedness and very loudness required of them. Moreover, they are not the creations of really great poets. And, with all due honor to him, Randall was not a great poet. Though greater than that other Southern lyrist, Father Ryan, yet he has not the exquisite delicacy of John B. Tabb, still less the sustained, serene thoughtfulness of Sydney Lanier, and is immeasurably below the immortal Edgar Allan Poe.

Notwithstanding, Randall is a poet of no mean degree, and "Maryland, My Maryland" is, in our opinion, by no means his best flight of poetic genius. Even as martial poems his "Pelham" and "At Arlington" are finer inspirations, whilst his sentimental efforts reveal a delicacy and rhythm and depth of feeling which will surprise those who know him only by his "Maryland." Take, as

instance, his "Far out at Sea." The last verse has all the swinging music and mysticism of Poe:

"Far out at sea! far out at sea!
And art thou happy, Melanie?
Oh! in thy grand and mystic grave
Beneath the blue, blue tropic wave,
Dost see, sweet child, the diamond blaze
Upon the Nereid of old days—
Dost hear the choral song of shells
More musical than golden bells—
And in thy ocean jubilee
Dost think of him who loveth thee?
Far out at sea! far out at sea!"

Yes, Randall belongs strictly to that peculiar school of Southern poetry which claims Poe, Lanier, Tabb, Ryan and Timrod. He has much of their delicacy, restrained passion, purity of emotion, gentle thoughtfulness, and all of the infinite pathos which lowers the key of singers of a lost cause.

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

Grammaire Hébraïque abrégée, précédée de Premiers Eléments accompagnés d'exercices à l'usage des commençants. Par J. Touzard, Professeur au Grand-Séminaire de S. Sulpice (depuis, à l'Institut Catholique de Paris), Paris, Lecoffre. 1905. 8°., pp. xxiv + 395 + 40. $1.00.

Grammaire Copte avec bibliographie, chrestomathie et vocabulaire, deuxième édition revue et augmentée par Alexis Mallon, S. J. Beyrouth, Imprimerie Catholique. 1907. 8°., pp. xv + 301 + 193. $1.80.

Grammaire Ethiopienne par Marius Chaine, S. J. Beyrouth, Imprimerie Catholique. 1907. Pp. ix + 308. $2.00.

1). Barring the sons of Germany, the would-be students of oriental languages are seriously handicapped by the dearth of grammars written in their native idioms. This is especially true of Hebrew, Ethiopic and Coptic, and also, though not to the same extent, of the other Semitic languages. Hence, the paradoxical witticism attributed to a famous professor of a sister institution, that German is the first

and foremost of Semitic languages. This certainly is a deplorable state of affairs. It seems unfair that a beginner who makes an attempt at the study of an oriental language without knowing whether he shall ever be able to make a success of it, should have to learn first another language as difficult as German. The upshot is that many are deterred from making the attempt, some of whom might have developed into good students of oriental languages. But apart from this consideration, the author of a grammar cannot help writing from the point of view of the language in which he is writing, and under the influence of grammatical preoccupations and methods entirely peculiar to his own language and country ; much to the detriment of students whose mother tongue is different and were born in countries where other preoccupations and methods prevail.

The three books with which we are concerned mark the dawn of a new era for France, and it is to be hoped that their authors may find imitators in other countries. In the mean time, thanks to the quasi-international character which French still retains in the Catholic Church at large, those books will prove a godsend to the lovers of oriental studies even outside of France for which they were primarily intended.

The Hebrew Grammar of Abbe Touzard as indicated by its title, does not claim to be complete. The aim of the author, as he modestly puts it, was first to help beginners overcome initial difficulties ; and, second, to initiate the students in comparative grammar and modern grammatical methods, a difficult task which few so far have dared undertake in an abridged grammar. The book is divided into two parts ; the first elements (pp. 1–68) for beginners, with useful exercises from Hebrew into French, and vice versa ; and the grammar proper (pp. 69–385). This is followed by an index of the biblical passages (pp. 387–395) and a most elaborate set of paradigms, including reconstructions of pre-biblical Hebrew verb and noun (pp. 1–40). As to the substance this grammar offers nothing new. The fact, however, that the author largely utilizes the grammars of Gesenius-Kautzsch and König "trying to bring out their principles with the clearness and accuracy demanded by a French public" is a sufficient guarantee as to the soundness in doctrine and clearness in presentation. The latter point the author has tried to emphasize by the use of quite a variety of types. The system is good in itself, but in this case has been carried too far. In some instances it is rather bewildering ; a word not underlined or someway or other marked as important is almost as difficult to find as a gentleman without an army

title in Kentucky.—One of the most conspicuous features of the book is the absence of references to other grammars and special treatises. The student will have in every case to swear "in verba magistri." For that reason, we should scarcely recommend Father Touzard's grammar to students who wish to learn Hebrew with a view to research work or even to follow, except in quite a general way, an occasional argument on some debated point of philological interpretation of the Bible. Such students have to know German, and will find it more profitable to start with Gesenius-Kautzsch's *Kleine Grammatik*, which will lead them up to the complete treatise of the same authors, so far the standard Hebrew Grammar, from which every piece of philological investigation must begin, and to which most of the German commentators refer their readers on difficult points of grammar. However, that class of students is comparatively small. Rightly or wrongly, most ecclesiastical students despair of reaching that point of efficiency. They study Hebrew as a complement of their theological curriculum, or at best, in view of their own private biblical studies. To those we are glad to say that they will find in Abbé Touzard's *Grammaire Abrégée* all they want and a great deal more that they need. More than that, their philological curiosity, if they have any, is sure to be aroused, and, feeling that they have succeeded in overcoming the first difficulties, they will soon crave not only for a deeper knowledge of Hebrew, but also for a certain acquaintance, at least, with Arabic.

We trust that the favor which this *Grammaire Abrégée* has already found in France and other lands will encourage the learned professor of the *Institut Catholique de Paris* to undertake the composition of a *Grammaire Complète*, so that the French clergy may have nothing to envy the sons of Germany.

2). The Coptic Grammar of Father Al. Mallon was first published in 1904. The fact alone that three years later a second edition had to be issued clearly bespeaks the need and usefulness of such a book, in spite of the excellent German grammars of Stern and Steindorff; and we entertain no doubt that this second edition corrected and increased will meet with still much greater favor. The book in its present shape, comprises (1) an *introduction*, with a very interesting section on the ancient Coptic grammarians, not to be found elsewhere (pp. 1–6); (2) the *grammar* proper including a list of the abbreviations and a plate exhibiting the cursive forms of the Coptic figures (pp. 7–236). The author considers principally the Bohairic dialect (pp. 7–224) very likely on account of the prominence it has acquired since the

twelfth or thirteenth century as the sole liturgical language throughout Egypt.—The peculiarities of the older Sahidic dialect which, in the first edition, had been briefly indicated in the body of the grammar are now presented in a separate grammatical sketch of that dialect (pp. 225–236).

(3) a *Bibliography* (by far the best and most complete up to date) of the Coptic literature.

(4) an excellent *Chrestomathy* (pp. 1–234) followed by Bohairic and Sahidic vocabularies (pp. 135–190); a table of the contents of the Chrestomathy, and a list of additions and corrections to the whole book (pp. 191–193).

In a general way, Fr. Mallon's book cannot be too highly commended. The author has read a good deal and felt he could write his own grammar, without copying from his predecessors. He may have erred here and there, mostly however in points of detail, and sometimes on account of the insufficiency or incorrectness of the materials at his disposal, rather than through his own failing rightly to interpret them. The few points we wish to criticise concern the general arrangement of the book, rather than its contents.

The remarks on the Sahidic dialect to be found pp. 113–115 of the Chrestomathy (not to mention others scattered throughout the grammar, for instance in sections 19, 20, 22, 36, 140, 151, etc.), would more fittingly have been placed in the sketch of Sahidic grammar which could easily be extended to the other dialects.—In spite of the table of contents at the beginning of the book, we badly miss an index of all the words, particles, etc., mentioned in the grammar, also a table of contents alphabetically arranged, as for instance, in Stern's grammar. It might have been preferable to have a special title page for the Chrestomathy, so it could be found separately; the author wishing to make one volume of the two parts, a special mode of pagination ought to have been adopted for the Chrestomathy, starred Arabic figures for instance, as is often done in similar cases.

3). Father Chaine's Ethiopic Grammar was also written for the benefit of beginners, yet in most cases it will prove to be all the average student needs to complete a general survey of the Semitic languages. The grammar proper treats in three books of the Phonetics, the Morphology and the Syntax. In the first book the author has restricted himself to the most simple and general principles on which all grammarians agree. The morphology is concise and abundantly furnished with paradigms. Numerous examples generally taken from the Old and New Testament or from books easily accessible illustrate the

syntax. In a general way the author has aimed at being clear and practical rather than deep, and has carefully avoided discussing points not yet fully established. The Chrestomathy and vocabulary (pp. 228–266) are good as far they go, but, to our mind, rather short. If Ethiopic texts have become, of late, more common and more accessible to students of moderate means, there is, as yet, no good lexicon, outside of Dillman's, which is both too large and too expensive for beginners. The literature (pp. 267–272) is short, but strictly speaking, sufficient, thanks to the well known work of Fumagalli to which the author refers for further information. The paradigms exhibited throughout the morphology are repeated at the end of the book, where, with two indexes, one of the contents and another of the words, they form a fascicle which can be bound with the rest or be kept separate (pp. 273–308).

It would not be fair to close this notice without commending the directors of the *Imprimerie Catholique* of Beyrouth for the correct and beautiful execution of Father Mallon's and Father Chaine's books, This establishment, which is to the Université St. Joseph what the Clarendon Press is to the University of Oxford, is rapidly becoming one of the best equipped Oriental presses of the world. May it continue to grow and prosper !

H. Hyvernat.

Elements d'Archeologie Chretienne, Notions Générales ; Itinéraire des Catacombes ; Basiliques et Eglises de Rome, par Horace Marucchi (Paris, 1903–1905), 3 vols. ; pp. 409, 590, 528.

Manuel d'Archeologie Chretienne, par Dom H. Leclercq, 2 vols. (Paris, 1907, 590, 681).

Handbuch Der christlichen Archäologie, von Carl Maria Kaufmann (Paderborn, 1905), illustrated, pp. 632.

Manuale di Archeologia Cristiana, da C. M. Kaufmann, tradotta dal Sac. Dott. Ettore Roccabruna, illustrato, Fr. Pustet (Rome, 1908), pp. 558.

1. It is not often that almost simultaneously there appear three such excellent manuals of an ecclesiastical science as the aforesaid works. The first of them we owe to the erudite and laborious investigator of the catacombs, Orazio Marucchi, a prominent

disciple of Giovanni Battista De Rossi and Professor of Christian Archaeology at the Propaganda College, Rome. It deals principally with the catacombs, their construction and ornamentation, the epitaphs and the art-objects (frescoes, sarcophagi, etc.) that they contain or once contained. The reader will find in these volumes a detailed description of each particular catacomb, with critical observations whose value is enhanced by the fact that Professor Marucchi has toiled from early youth amid these monuments of ancient Christian piety, and is yet one of the most active of the little band of Roman scholars, priests and laymen, who pursue with religious ardour a deeper knowledge of the primitive Christian life as it now lies open before us in the great network of ancient Christian cemeteries that encircle the Eternal City.

2. To the indefatigable Dom Leclercq Christian scholarship is indebted for two admirable volumes that quite exhaust in every direction the province of Christian Archaeology in its broadest outlines, meaning thereby not only the archaeology of the Catacombs and the first four or five centuries of Christian life, but also that of the Early Middle Ages. His second volume is practically an introduction to a vast history of medieval Christian art, dealing as it does with all known channels created by the artistic spirit in its search of the beautiful as a means of worship. The reader will find here accurate information, often of a rare kind, concerning Christian paintings, mosaics, statuary and polychromy, basreliefs, ivories, carved stones, gold and silver work, artistic glass, terra cotta, castings, numismatics, textile objects, miniatures and the minor arts (medals, crystal work, artistic work in stucco, amber, wood, bone, etc.). Extensive and well-chosen bibliographies accompany each section, and numerous illustrations add to the value of the work. In the first volume the pages on the Jewish catacombs at Rome, the chronological classification of the Roman and Neapolitan catacomb frescoes, and the topographical classification (428-494) of all early Christian cemeteries, crypts, baptisteries, and chapels, are of primary value and serviceableness. A more delightful work for the scholarly ecclesiastical student or for any one interested in the manifold external forms of primitive ecclesiastical influence can scarcely be imagined.

3-4. Abundance and freshness of information, good order, accuracy of statement, and richness of documentation characterize the German manual of Dr. Kaufmann, an Italian translation of which is now offered to the public. In one volume it aims at presenting

the doctrine somewhat more elaborately set forth in the works of Marucchi and Leclercq. The work of Dr. Kaufman is very welcome, since the numerous manuals called forth in the seventies by De Rossi's *Roma Sotterranea* are now somewhat antiquated, least of all, however the valuable work of Northcote and Brownlow. In these pages of Dr. Kaufmann the student of Christian antiquities may follow the latest studies and researches in the catacombs and in all the earliest forms of Christian art (inscriptions, frescoes, statuary, sarcophagi, etc.).

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

The Economic History of the United States, By Ernest Ludlow Bogart, Ph. D. Longmans (New York, 1907). Pp. xiii, 522.

Although nominally treating of the economic history of the United States this work is essentially a text-book history of production in the United States. As the Preface states, "there is traced the growth of industry, agriculture, commerce, transportation, population, and labor, from the simple isolated agricultural communities of the colonies to the complex industrial and commercial society of to-day." The history of tariff, currency, banking-crises, etc., is touched upon only incidentally in the way of explanation of industrial, commercial, or transportation changes, and problems of capital organizations, trade-unionism, immigration, etc., are outlined but briefly as concomitants of economic growth. The main thesis is throughout the development of the wealth-producing resources of the country.

Professor Bogart tells his story graphically and interestingly. Maps and illustrations are used freely, and accurate quantitative notions are conveyed by frequent statistical tables. The work is especially strong in the description of the mechanical operation and productive influence of agricultural and manufacturing machinery. In fact the whole plan, tone, and make-up of the book are well calculated to give the reader an intelligent comprehension of the production of physical wealth in the United States as it is actually carried on, and of how this gigantic, complex and unified wealth-producing organism has been developed from simple colonial beginnings. It is in this that the value of the work lies.

The book is intended for the use of students of both history and economics. For the former it supplies in convenient form those important facts of the development of the material basis of our national life which are often omitted from and never adequately explained in the text-book histories. The necessity of a firm grasp of these facts for a proper understanding of our political history is not contested. To quote from Professor Bogart, "The keynote of the national history of the United States is to be found in this work of winning a continent from Nature and subduing it to the uses of man. A truly gigantic task, it has absorbed the main energies of the American people from the beginning, and has been approached in significance only by the struggle to preserve the Union. Inevitably it has left its impress on the character and ambitions of the people."

The need of a descriptive study of American industrial life in its historical setting has long been felt by teachers of elementary economics. It is generally recognized that a clear quantitative and qualitative comprehension of the actual processes of wealth production greatly aids the student in understanding the nature of the problems to which the complexity of our industrial system gives use. Admittedly, too, the underlying forces can more easily be detected and their workings followed if these are studied first in their lowest terms in simple industry, and the disturbing factors introduced and explained in the order of their historical emergence. Yet even the best economic text-books fall far short of the desired presentation of the salient facts and interrelations of agencies in present day production in the United States, to say nothing of their failure to point out the revolutionary growth and changing relations of productive factors since colonial times. The result is that the student is pushed into the study of theories of exchange and distribution without definite ideas of the close interdependence of exchange and production or of the functions actually performed in the production of wealth by the factors claiming shares of the product in distribution.

The present work, therefore, should prove a welcome addition to the text-book material for the study of production.

D. A. McCabe.

BOOK NOTICES.

That highest poetry can be allied to religious sentiments the hymns of St. Thomas, *The Burning Babe* of Southwell, the writings of Herbert and Crashaw, the *Nativity Ode* of Milton, or the sweet strains of Faber and Newman and Keble—to name only a few such works taken at random from among many—abundantly prove. Nor is it strange that religion should have evoked into expression the sublimest utterances of the poet's thought. For, when all is said and done, what is so inwrought into the very fibers of the being of most men and women as religion? Even those poets, whose general works are not the most edifying, have not always been able to escape the allurements of the "heavenly muse." We have been led into this train of thought by the perusal of a slim volume of poems, entitled THOUGHTS AND FANCIES, by F. C. Kolbe, D. D. (New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, Benziger Brothers, 1907, 75 cents, net). Rev. Dr. Kolbe is assuredly a sweet singer, as well as being, if we are rightly informed, a distinguished educationalist. His nine poems "For the Madonna" show that he is a master of lyric. His twelve sonnets prove him to be a deft craftsman in that most elusive and difficult form of verse composition. His "Sonnet on the Sonnet" at once challenges comparison with Wordsworth's "Scorn not the Sonnet," and it is no heresy in criticism to say that it does not entirely suffer from the contrast. In our opinion, the close of Dr. Kolbe's sonnet is more artistic, because less startlingly abrupt, than Wordsworth's final line. From the "Songs of Patriotism" it is evident that there is a warm corner in the author's heart for South Africa. In "The Crowning of Edward VII and Alexandra" he uses with fine effect the long seven-footed rhyming couplet. Those who bear in mind the Norman Conquest, or the Revolution of 1688, or even the Conventions in virtue of which Victoria ascended the British throne and Edward VII succeeded her, will smile, some cynically, others good-humouredly, according to individual disposition, at the line:—"We take our Kings by God's own choice, the sacred law of birth:" Altogether, this is a notable little book of poetry. In addition to being well written, it is, as it deserves to be, well printed and turned out.

To have high ideals in this world of materialism is a good thing. To live up to one's ideals, to have the courage to express them, is noble. We infer from A CONCORD OF SWEET NOTES by Leon M. Linden, (J. S. Hyland & Co., Chicago, 1908, price one dollar) that the author, Father Linden, of Aurora, Ill., is good and noble. There is much to commend in this book of poems. Such pieces as "The Violin," "The Awakening" and "My Childhood Days" ring tuneful and true. There is soul-stirring patriotism in "America." But the execution is unequal. In the Foreword by Charles J. O'Malley there occur the following sentences:—

"It is not claimed for Father Linden's poetry that it is without flaws. He is an artist without leisure to chisel and polish. A priest who toils in his parish

can sing only when opportunity comes, and subject to many interruptions; yet the poems in this collection show that he is a true singer and that in time greater songs may be expected."

With all of this we unhesitatingly agree. There are obvious flaws in many of the poems now before us. For example, there are many slip-shod—nay downright faulty—rhymes. We would respectfully point out that assonance is not rhyme. About and aloud; meadows and fellows; morning and adorning; gather and gladder; twinkling and winking; fount and ground; alone and home; pain and maimed; rays and bathers; home and unknown; sod and top; glib and mead are *not* rhymes. And why speak of the moon as Luna, or of the sun as Helios, or Scorching Phoebus, or old Sol? Again, to call the moon the "silver mirror of the silent night," or to describe "The stealthy glare of Luna's light" is suspiciously like that eighteenth-century "poetic diction" which found so much disfavour in the judgment of the critics and the poets of the newer school of Romanticism. These, however, are minor defects, which, in future efforts, can be easily avoided. In many respects Father Linden strikes us as having the true poetic *verve*, and, as he has youth on his side, we may naturally look forward to other and better productions from his maturer years.

As we go to press the third volume of THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA reaches us (Robert Appleton Company, 39 West 38th Street, New York; in buckram $6.00; half morocco, $8.00). In one of the next issues of the BULLETIN we shall return to this very important work, already several times described at length in our pages. For the present it may suffice that we call the attention of our readers to the great intellectual wealth contained in this volume. Among the leading articles are the following: *Buddhism, Bullarium, Byzantine Empire, Byzantine Literature, Cambridge, Canaan, Canada, Catafalque, Calendar, Chalice, Chronology, Christmas, Canons, Canons Apostolic, Calvin, Calvinism, Canticle of Canticles, Celibacy, Chapter, Cathedral, Cathedraticum, California, California Missions, Cistercians, Camaldolese, Carmelite, Carthusians, Canon of Scripture, Caroline Books, Carlovingian Schools, Cecilia, Catherine, Charles Borromeo, Cardinal, Cardinal Vicar, Cardinal Protector, Citeaux, Clairvaux, Celtic Rite, Catholic Church, Cemetery, Catacombs, Carthage, Chair of Peter, Civil Allegiance, Censorship of Books, Chalcedon, Charlemagne, Charles V, Charity, Character, Christianity, Christendom.* In addition there is the usual excellent selection of the more important biographies, also every important title of ecclesiastical geography and topography falling within the given space, etc., etc., etc. The biographies from *Brownson* to *Cervantes* are all of a very high order of interest. If we had to single out for special praise, one article among the many splendid contributions, it would be the lengthy study on *China* by M. Henri Cordier, professor at Paris of the geography, history and legislation of the states of the far Orient, and well-known as one of the most distinguished living Sinologues. It is safe to say that for the purpose of a Catholic Encyclopedia, there is nothing comparable to this fine article.

EPISCOPAL CONSECRATION OF RT. REV. DENIS J. O'CONNELL, D. D.

The consecration of the Right Reverend Rector as Titular Bishop of Sebaste took place Sunday May 3, at the Cathedral in Baltimore. The consecrator was His Eminence the Chancellor, James Cardinal Gibbons. The assistant-consecrators were Archbishop Moeller of Cincinnati and Bishop Northrop of Charleston. The sermon was delivered by Very Rev. Dr. Shahan, Professor of Church History in the University. The various faculties of the University assisted in academic costume. Among the distinguished ecclesiastics present were Mgr. Falconio, Apostolic Delegate to the United States and Mgr. Aversa, Apostolic Delegate to Cuba and Porto Rico, also about thirty archbishops and bishops. The sanctuary was filled with the invited clergy, among them representatives of the Alumni of the University and the Alumni of the American College at Rome. At the conclusion of the ceremony dinner was served at St. Mary's Seminary. On the occasion of his consecration the Right Reverend Rector received from the professors and students of the University a number of gifts, among them an episcopal cross and chain from the professors, a precious mitre from the students of Divinity Hall and a crozier from the students of Albert Hall. At their annual meeting, in the Hotel Savoy, New York, the Alumni of the American College, Rome, presented him with a ring and an episcopal chain.

UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

The Meeting of the Board of Trustees. At the meeting of the Board of Trustees, which was held in Caldwell Hall, on Wednesday, May 6th, Archbishops Moeller of Cincinnati, Blenk of New Orleans and O'Connell of Boston were present for the first time, as were Messrs. Walter J. Smith of Philadelphia, Eugene A. Philbin of New York and Richard C. Kerens of St. Louis. Mr. John D. Crimmins of New York was also present. The meeting, which was a very satisfactory one, confined its attention to academic affairs. The Board of Trustees feeling satisfied with the present financial footing of the University and with the present internal academic conditions, turned its attention to the last remaining points, left unfinished in previous meetings, namely, the necessity of increasing the number of students, especially in the Department of Theology. Each ecclesiastical member of the Board promised to send at least, one student next year and His Eminence the Chancellor was requested to write, in the name of the Board of Trustees, to every Bishop in the United States asking coöperation in this matter.

The rest of the time of the meeting was spent in examining the Report of the Committee on Revision. The Committee reported the condition of the University to be very satisfactory and suggested a number of improvements of an academic character.

The date of the next meeting was fixed for November 18th.

Rev. Thomas Sim Lee Fellowship in Theology. It is with great pleasure that we announce the establishment by Rev. Thomas Sim Lee (St. Mathew's Church, Washington, D. C.) of a Fellowship in the Faculty of Theology to aid priests in acquiring the degree Doctor of Theology. For this laudable purpose Father Lee has given to the Board of Trustees the sum of ten thousand dollars. The Fellowship is at the disposition of the University and has attached to it but one condition, namely, the obligation of saying twelve masses annually for the repose of the souls of the donor's parents, their ancestors and descendants. A suitable marble tablet will be set up in a conspicuous place within the University, record-

ing the nature and purpose of this generous deed. The University hereby expresses its gratitude to Father Lee for a noble act in favor of the members of our Catholic clergy. Its results, it is true, will mature at some later time, but we have before us the example of Oxford and Cambridge to prove that there is no more satisfactory investment of money than the perpetual endowment of scholarships and fellowships at a great intellectual centre.

The Knights of Columbus' Endowment Fund. At the meeting of the Board of Trustees Archbishop Glennon reported favorably on the project of the endowment fund by the Knights of Columbus. The same evening, at a meeting held at Rauscher's, Supreme Knight Hearn promised his hearty coöperation and foretold the success of the project.

The A. O. H. Scholarships. Messrs. P. J. Haltigan and P. T. Moran, representing the Ancient Order of Hibernians, were admitted to the meeting of the Board of Trustees in order to deliberate as to the conditions on which scholarships were to be founded at the University by their Order. They intend to lay the matter before the Delegates at the approaching Convention at Indianapolis.

Baccalaureate Sermon and Commencement Day Discourse. Father Joseph F. Smith of New York, President of the Alumni Association of the University, will deliver the Baccalaureate Sermon on Sunday, June 7th. Mr. Walter J. Smith of Philadelphia, member of the Board of Trustees, will deliver the Commencement Discourse at the exercises to be held at the University on Wednesday, June 10th.

Visit of Cardinal Logue. On Tuesday, May 5th, His Eminence Cardinal Logue, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland, visited the University and was entertained at dinner at Caldwell Hall. There were present to greet the distinguished visitor His Eminence the Chancellor, several members of the Board of Trustees, a number of prominent ecclesiastical and lay guests, all the members of the Faculties and the students of Divinity at the University.

The Catholic University of America Literary and Debating Society. The Catholic University of America Literary and De-

bating Society held a debate on the evening of April 26th. The question discussed was "Resolved that Capital Punishment should be abolished." After a complete discussion of the question a decision was rendered in favor of the negative, and awarding to Martin F. Douglas the honor of the best individual debater. The judges on the occasion were the Rev. Dr. Spensley, Messrs. John C. Moran, Arthur J. Crotty and George A. Canale. The affirmative was represented by Martin F. Douglas and Vincent L. Toomey; the negative by Leo J. Koontz and Leo Gallagher.

Among those present were the sophomore, junior and Senior classes of Trinity College, and the graduation class of the Holy Cross Academy.

Professor P. J. Lennox, whose loyal support has been so instrumental in the establishment of the Literary and Debating Society, honored it on the 7th inst. by a reading on the "Life and Character of Oliver Goldsmith."

VINCENT L. TOOMEY,
Recording Secretary.

NECROLOGY.

RIGHT REVEREND IGNATIUS F. HORSTMANN, D. D., Bishop of Cleveland.

By the death of Bishop Horstmann, of Cleveland, the University loses a devoted member of its Board of Trustees and a generous benefactor.

Ignatius F. Horstmann was born in Philadelphia, December 16, 1840. After graduating in 1857 from the Central High School in Philadelphia he entered the Seminary at Glen Riddle, from which in 1860 he went to the American College in Rome, where he completed his studies in philosophy and theology and in 1865 was ordained to the priesthood and received the degree of Doctor of Theology. From 1866 to 1877 he taught philosophy, German and Hebrew in the Seminary of his native diocese. In 1877 he was appointed Chancellor of the diocese and pastor of St. Mary's Church. On February 25th, 1892, he was consecrated Bishop of Cleveland and for the last sixteen years labored successfully for the upbuilding of the Church in that diocese, and won the love and veneration of all who knew him. Bishop Horstmann was, in point of service, one of the oldest members of the Board of Trustees, was ever assiduous in attendance at their meetings, and exhibited always a sincere and intelligent interest in the work and the future of the University.

R. I. P.